

Publications

BULLETIN
OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
1915: No. 31

JUNE 1

1915

Woman Suffrage
Bibliography and Selected Arguments

Edited by

EDWIN DuBOIS SHURTER

Head of the Public Discussion Division, Department of Extension



PUBLISHED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AUSTIN, TEXAS

Entered as second class mail matter at the postoffice at Austin, Texas

DEPARTMENT OF EXTENSION.

The Department of Extension of the University of Texas was established for the purpose of rendering service to the people of the State generally, and especially to those who are unable to attend the University. The work of this department is carried on under the following five divisions:

Public Discussion Division.

This division has immediate charge of "The University Interscholastic League." This is an organization of the schools of Texas for the purpose of promoting contests in debate, declamation, spelling, essay-writing, and athletics. The University is desirous of aiding the schools in the matter of training their students for citizenship; and also to aid teachers in developing, controlling, and standardizing athletic activities in the schools. Every school in Texas, no matter how small, should become a member of this organization.

This division is also engaged in the preparation of reference lists and material on various subjects of general interest, and the collection of "package" libraries for loaning to citizens of Texas upon application. Books and pamphlets thus loaned may be kept not longer than two weeks. The person to whom material is loaned pays the postage both ways. University bulletins need not be returned unless specially requested. Loan libraries are now ready on the following subjects: Agriculture; Airships; Alcohol; Arbitration; Athletics; Banks and Banking; Birds; Boy Problem; Boy Scouts; Canning Clubs; Capital Punishment; Child Labor; Child Study; Child Welfare; Christmas; Cigarette Habit; Civil Service; Co-education; Commission Government; Compulsory Education; Conservation of Resources; Contagion and Contagious Diseases; Convict Labor; Co-operative Marketing; Corn; Cost of Living; Cotton; Crime and Criminals; Disarmament; Domestic Science; Drama; European War; Flies; Games; Germany; Government Ownership of Public Utilities; Hogs; Hours of Labor; Immigration; Income Tax; Indians; Industrial Education; Initiative and Referendum; Irrigation; Journalism; Juvenile Courts; Kindergarten; Labor Unions; Land Tenantry; Manual Training; Merchant Marine; Mexico; Military Education; Milk; Minimum Wage; Monopolies; Monroe Doctrine; Montessori Teaching; Mothers Clubs; Moving Pictures; Municipal Improvement; Municipal Ownership; Nature Study; Negro; Nutrition; Old Age Pensions; Open and Closed Shop; Panama Canal; Panama-Pacific Exposition; Parcel Post; Peace; Pecan Culture; Philippines; Playgrounds; Poultry; Presidential Term; Prison Reform; Prohibition; Public Health; Railroads; Recall; Recitations and Readings; Red Cross; Religious Education; Roads; Rural Credit; Rural Life; Rural Schools; Russia; Sanitation; School Gardens; Schoolhouses; School Hygiene; School Libraries; School Lunches; Sewage; Short Story; Single Tax; Social Center; Socialism; South America; Story Telling; Submarine Warfare; Suffrage-Educational Qualification; Tariff; United States Army; United States Navy; Woman Labor; Woman Suffrage; Women's Clubs.

Clippings and miscellaneous material have also been collected on various other subjects. Correspondence is invited. Address Loan Librarian, University, Austin.

Public Lecture Division.

Provision has been made to allow members of the staff of instruc-

(Continued on inside back cover)

B102-615-5m-8278

BULLETIN
OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
1915: No. 31

JUNE 1

1915

Woman Suffrage
Bibliography and Selected Arguments

Edited by
EDWIN DuBOIS SHURTER
Head of the Public Discussion Division, Department of Extension



PUBLISHED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AUSTIN, TEXAS

Entered as second class mail matter at the postoffice at Austin, Texas

The benefits of education and of useful knowledge, generally diffused through a community, are essential to the preservation of a free government.

Sam Houston.

Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. . . . It is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge and the only security that freemen desire.

President Mirabeau B. Lamar.

It is only out of the contest of facts and brains that the right can ever be evolved—only on the anvil of discussion can the spark of truth be struck out.

Joseph H. Choate.

PREFACE.

This bulletin was originally prepared primarily for use by schools in Texas belonging to the University Interscholastic League during the year 1912-13, the question for the Interscholastic debates that year being, "*Resolved, That women in Texas should be granted the suffrage on equal terms with men.*" The general demand for the bulletin has been such as to justify the issue of a new edition. Some of the articles contained in the first edition have been omitted and other and more recent articles substituted in order to bring the discussion up to date.

This bulletin will be mailed free to citizens of Texas upon application; to those outside the State the price is 15 cents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The government publications listed below can usually be obtained by a student through the Congressman from his district. If more affirmative material is wanted than is given in this bulletin, write to the National American Woman Suffrage Association, 505 5th Ave., New York City, for a list of pamphlets and prices. The best single publication to get from this Association is a bound volume entitled "Woman Suffrage, Arguments and Results." Price, 25c. For additional material on the negative side in addition to the references given in this bibliography, send to the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, 29 W. 39th St., New York City, and to the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston, for a list of pamphlets that these organizations have for distribution.

GENERAL REFERENCES.

Books, Pamphlets and Documents.

A star () preceding a reference indicates that the entire article or part of it has been reprinted in this bulletin.*

BLISS, WILLIAM D. P. *New Encyclopedia of Social Reform*. 1908, pp. 1295-1303.

BRYCE, JAMES, *American Commonwealth*. 3d ed., Vol. II. Chap. XCIII.

Congressional Record. 18:987-1002. January 25, 1887. *Woman Suffrage*.

HECKER, EUGENE A. *A Short History of Women's Rights*. G. P. Putnam & Sons. Price, \$1.50. Comprehensive survey of the changing status of woman from the days of Augustus to the present, with special reference to England and the United States.

New American Supplement to the Encyclopedia Britannica. Vol. V. p. 3181.

New International Encyclopedia. *Woman Suffrage*.

REMBAUGH, BERTHA. *The Political Status of Women in the United States*. Woman Suffrage Association, New York. Price, \$1.10. A digest of the laws concerning women in the various States and Territories.

SCHIRMACHER, K. *The Modern Women's Rights Movement*. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price, \$1.50. Comprehensive survey of the movement all over the world. Not confined to Woman Suffrage.

SQUIRE, BELLE. *The Woman Movement in America*. Woman

Suffrage Association, New York. Price, 75c. Series of sketches of different phases and periods of the woman movement in America.

*SUMNER, HELEN L. *Equal Suffrage*. The results of an investigation in Colorado made for the Collegiate Equal Suffrage League of New York State. Harper & Bros., New York City, 1909. Price, \$2.50.

This is an important survey of the results of woman suffrage in Colorado, and will be helpful to both affirmative and negative sides. The conclusions of each chapter are contained in this bulletin.

United States 47th Congress, 1st session, Senate Report, 686. Reports on Woman Suffrage.

United States 48th Congress, 1st session, Senate Report, 399. Report of the committee on Woman Suffrage.

United States 48th Congress, 1st session, House Report. 1330. Extending the Right of Suffrage to Women.

United States 52nd Congress, 2nd session, Senate Report, 1143. Report of the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

United States 62nd Congress, 2nd session, House Document No. 762.

Magazine Articles.

American Magazine, 69; 468-81. February, 1911. *American Woman: Her First Declaration of Independence*. Ida M. Tarbell.

Ann. Am. Acad. 35 sup.: 6-9. May, 1910. *Discussion of Equal Suffrage*. R. L. Owen.

ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY. 35 sup. 1-37. May, 1910. *Significance of the Woman Suffrage Movement*. (Contains seven papers, four in favor of Woman Suffrage and three against.)

ATLANTIC MONTHLY. 102:343-6. September, 1908. *English Working Woman and the Franchise*. Edith Abbott.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY. 105:559-70. April, 1910. *Woman's War*. M. Johnson.

*CHAUTAUQUAN. 13:72-7. April, 1891. *A Symposium—Woman Suffrage*.

CHAUTAUQUAN. 34:482-4. February, 1902. *Woman Suffrage in Colorado*. William Macleod Raine.

CHAUTAUQUAN. 59:69-83. June, 1910. *Woman Suffrage Movement*.

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. 100:91-104. July, 1911. *Women, Ancient and Modern*.

HARPER'S WEEKLY. 44:949-50. October 6, 1900. *Female Suffrage in the United States*. J. D. Whelpley.

HIBBERT JOURNAL. 9:424-6. 163-8. January, October, 1911. *Principal Childs on Woman Suffrage*.

HIBBERT JOURNAL. 8:721-38. July, 1910. *A Review and a Conclusion*. W. M. Childs.

*Quoted from in this bulletin.

INDEPENDENT. 69:32-4. July 1, 1910. *Woman Movement in England and America*. D. B. Montefiore.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 194:271-81. August, 1911. *Past, Present and Future*. G. Overton.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 193:60-71. January, 1911.

OUTLOOK. 94:375-7. February, 1910. *Do Women Wish to Vote?*

OUTLOOK. 98:757. August, 1911. *Results of Women Suffrage*.

AFFIRMATIVE REFERENCES.

Books, Pamphlets and Documents.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. 16:1322-5. February 6, 1885. *Woman Suffrage*. Thomas W. Palmer.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. 18:34-8. December 8, 1886. *Joint Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States*.

CREEL, GEORGE, and JUDGE BEN B. LINDSEY. *Measuring Up Equal Suffrage*.

*CURTIS, GEORGE WILLIAM. *Orations and Addresses*, edited by Charles Eliot Norton. Vol. I, pp. 181-213. *The Right of Suffrage*. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1894.

An address given before the constitutional convention of the State of New York, at Albany, in 1867, following the proposal of an amendment in favor of woman suffrage.

DOHONEY, E. L. *Full Citizen's Suffrage*. An address before the Texas Legislature, Feb. 2, 1911. Sent on application to E. L. Dohoney, Paris, Texas.

*EASTMAN, MAX. *Is Woman Suffrage Important?*

HIGGINSON, THOMAS WENTWORTH. *Common Sense About Women*. Pp. 303-403. Lee & Shepard, Boston. 1882.

MILL, JOHN STUART. *The Subjection of Women*. Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1869.

TAYLOR, EDWARD T. *Speech on "Equal Suffrage in Colorado."* Congressional Record of May 24, 1912. A good, up-to-date resumé.

*THOMAS, MISS M. CAREY. Address before the National Woman Suffrage Association.

United States 47th Congress, 1st session. Senate Miscellaneous Document 74.

Arguments of the Woman-Suffrage Delegates before the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, January 23, 1880.

United States 49th Congress, 1st session. Senate Report 70. Report of the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

*Quoted from in this Bulletin.

United States 50th Congress, 2nd session. Senate Report 2543. Report of the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

United States 51st Congress, 1st session. Senate Report 1576. Report of the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

United States 51st Congress, 1st session. House Report 2254. *Woman Suffrage*.

United States 53rd Congress, 2nd session. Senate Miscellaneous Document 121. Hearing before the Committee on Woman Suffrage, February 21, 1894.

United States 54th Congress, 1st session. Senate Document 157. Report of Hearing before the Committee on Woman Suffrage, January 28, 1896.

Reports and Pamphlets may be obtained from the secretary of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, 505 Fifth Ave., New York City.

Magazine Articles.

AMERICAN MAGAZINE. 67:288-90. January, 1909. *Problem of the Intellectual Woman*. C. M. H.

ANNALS OF AMER. ACAD. 56:122-3. November, 1914. *Political Equality for Women and Women's Wages*.

ANNALS OF AMER. ACAD. 56:93-8. November, 1914. *Equal Suffrage a Problem of Political Justice*.

*ARENA. 10:201-13. July, 1894. *Last Protest Against Woman's Enfranchisement*. James L. Hughes.

*ARENA. 40:92-4. July, 1908. *Shall Our Mothers, Wives, and Sisters Be Our Equals or Our Subjects?* Frank Parsons.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY. 102:196-202. August, 1908. *What It Means to Be an Enfranchised Woman*. Ellis Meredith.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY. 105:297-301. March, 1910. *Determination of Women to Exercise the Suffrage*.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY. 106:289-303. September, 1910. *Ladies' Battle*.

BOOKMAN. 31:312-4. May, 1910. *Miss Johnson and Woman Suffrage*. A. N. Meyer.

CANADIAN MAGAZINE. 33:17-21. May, 1909. *Why I Am a Suffragette*. Arthur Hawkes.

COLLIER'S WEEKLY. 46:25. January 11, 1911. *Woman's Victory in Washington*.

CURRENT LITERATURE. 51:596-600. December, 1911. *Woman's Suffrage Marching On*.

NINETEENTH CENTURY. 64:495-506. September, 1908. *Women and the Suffrage*. Eva Gore-Booth.

*Quoted from in this Bulletin.

*CENTURY. March, 1914. *What Have Women Done With the Vote?* George Creel.

*CENTURY. 48:605-13. August, 1894. *Right and Expediency of Woman Suffrage.* George F. Hoar.

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. 83:653-60. May, 1903. *Justice for the Gander—Justice for the Goose.* Francis Power Cobbe.

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. 94:11-6. July, 1908. *Liberalism and Woman's Suffrage.* Bertrand Russell.

DIAL. 51:45-8. July 16, 1911. *Votes for Women.* T. D. C. Cockerell.

EVERYBODY'S MAGAZINE. 21:723-38. December, 1909. *Why?* Elizabeth Robins.

*FORUM. February, 1910. *Woman Suffrage As It Looks Today.* Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont.

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW. 89:634-44. April, 1908. *Ideals of a Woman's Party.* Agnes Grove.

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW. 93:268-73. *Julia Ward Howe, the Veteran Suffragist.* C. E. Maud.

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW. 90:258-71. August, 1908. *Sex Disability and Adult Suffrage.* Teresa Billington-Greig.

HARPER'S BAZAR. 45:38. January, 1911. *New State for Woman Suffrage.* I. H. Harper.

HARPER'S BAZAR. 45:101-578. February and December, 1911. *Votes for Women.* I. H. Harper.

HARPER'S BAZAR. 45:346. July, 1911. *Victory in Sight.* I. H. Harper.

HARPER'S BAZAR. 44:240-1. April, 1910. *Mrs. MacKay at Work.* O. H. Dunbar.

HARPER'S BAZAR. 44:289. April, 1910. *Temptations and Woman Suffrage.* P. Leonard.

HARPER'S WEEKLY. 53:6. July 31, 1909. *Influence Not Government.* H. S. Howard.

*INDEPENDENT. November 2, 1911. *Woman Suffrage in Six States.* I. H. Harper.

INDEPENDENT. 68:902-4. April 2, 1910. *President and Suffrage.* I. H. Harper.

INDEPENDENT. 71:804-10. October 12, 1911. *Spectacular Woman Suffrage in America.* B. D. Knabe.

INDEPENDENT. 71:104-5. November 10, 1911. *Crumbs for Women.*

INDEPENDENT. 82:3-4. April 15, 1915. *Justice and Desirability of Woman Suffrage.*

LADIES' HOME JOURNAL. 27:21-2. *Why Women Should Vote.*

*Quoted from in this Bulletin.

LADIES' HOME JOURNAL. 30:24. January, 1913. *Democratization of Woman.*

LIVING AGE. 277:119-21. April 12, 1913. *Future of Free Womanhood.*

McCLURE'S. 40:181. February, 1913. *Liberation of a Sex.*

McCLURE'S. 40:206. March, 1913. *The Changing Home.*

NINETEENTH CENTURY. 61:472-6. March, 1907. *Women and Politics: A Reply.* Eva Gore-Booth.

*NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 163:91-7. July, 1896. *Why Woman Suffrage Important?* M. Eastman.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 163:91-7. July, 1896. *Why Women Should Have the Ballot.* John Gibbon.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 178:362-74. March, 1904. *Would Woman Suffrage Benefit the State and Woman Herself?* I. H. Harper.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 179:30-41. July, 1904. *Why Women Cannot Vote in the United States.* I. H. Harper.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 183:689-90. October 5, 1906. *Necessity of Woman Suffrage.*

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 183:830-1. October 19, 1906. *Woman's Inherent Right to Vote.*

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 183:1203-6. December 7, 1906. *Woman Suffrage in Colorado.*

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 188:650-8. November, 1908. *Woman Movement in England.* Charles F. Aked.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 190:664-74. November, 1909. *Woman's Right to Govern Herself.* A. E. Belmont.

*NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 183:1272-9. 1906. *Australian Women and the Ballot.* Alice Henry.

*NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 191:75-86. January, 1910. *Appeal of Politics to Women.* R. S. Sutherland.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 191:701-20. May, 1910. *Inherent Right.* G. Harvey.

OUTLOOK. 91:780-4. April 3, 1909. *Case for Woman Suffrage.* Julia Ward Howe.

PUBLIC. 11:205-6. May 29, 1908. *Women Who Know That They Need the Ballot.* Jane Addams.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS. 37:484-6. April, 1908. *Campaign of the English Suffragettes.*

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. 174:629-36. December, 1910. *Right to Vote.* A. B. W. Chapman.

*Quoted from in this Bulletin.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. 175:524-6. March, 1911. *Greatest Political Question of the Day*. A. B. W. Chapman.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. 174:386-91. October, 1910. *Division of Labor and the Ballot*. R. V. Phelan.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. 173:400-12. April, 1910. *From Chattel to Suffragette*. B. Houghton.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. 171:383-95. April, 1909. *Women's Industries*. Francis Swiney.

WOMAN'S HOME COMPANION. April, 1908, page 20. *Working Woman and the Ballot*. Jane Addams.

WORLD TODAY. 12:418-21. April, 1907. *Housekeepers' Need of the Ballot*. Molly Warren.

WORLD TODAY. 21:1171-8. October, 1911. *Why I Am a Suffragist*. Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont.

WORLD'S WORK. 22:14733-45. August, 1911. *Recent Strides of Woman Suffrage*. B. D. Knabe.

*WORLD'S WORK. February, 1912. *Woman, the Savior of the State*. Selma Lagerlof. Also, *An Equal Suffrage State in Earnest*.

NEGATIVE REFERENCES.

Books, Pamphlets and Documents.

*BUCKLEY, JAMES MONROE. *Wrong and Peril of Woman Suffrage*. The Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1909.

*BROWN, JUSTICE. *Woman Suffrage*.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. 18:980-3. January 25, 1883. *Woman Suffrage*. Joseph E. Brown.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. 18:986-7. January 25, 1887. *Woman Suffrage*. George G. Vest.

JOHNSON, HELEN KENDRICK. *Woman and the Republic*. D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1897.

JOHNSON, ROSSITER. *Blank-Cartridge Ballot*. New York State Association Opposed to the Extension of the Suffrage to Women.

PARKMAN, FRANCIS. *Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage*. Issued by the Massachusetts Man Suffrage Association, 7 Park St., Boston.

SMITH, GOLDWIN. *Essays on Questions of the Day*. Pp. 197-238. Macmillan & Co., New York, N. Y. 1894.

United States 52nd Congress, 2nd session. Senate Miscellaneous Document 28. Memorial of Caroline F. Corbin for American Women Remonstrants to the Extension of Suffrage to Women, Praying for a Hearing Before Congress.

Printed with this memorial is a letter from the Right. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M. P., remonstrating against female suffrage.

*Quoted from in this Bulletin.

United States 54th Congress, 1st session. Senate Report 787. Minority Report of the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Reports and pamphlets may be obtained from New York Association Opposed to the extension of Suffrage to Women, 29 West 39th Street, New York City. Also from the secretaries to the Illinois Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women, 597 Dearborn Ave., Chicago, Ill., and the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association, P. O. Box 134, Brookline, Mass.

Magazine Articles.

ANNALS OF AM. ACAD. 35: sup. 10-15. May, 1910. *Logical Basis of Woman Suffrage*. A. G. Spencer.

ANNALS AM. ACAD. 35: sup 36-7. May, 1910. *Inadvisability of Woman Suffrage*. C. H. Parkhurst.

ANNALS AM. ACAD. 35: sup. 28-32. May, 1910. *Answers to Arguments in Favor of Woman Suffrage*. L. Abbott.

ANNALS AM. ACAD. 56:99-104. November, 1914. *Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights*.

AMERICAN MONTHLY. 72611-9. September, 1911. *Getting Out the Vote, Week's Automobile Campaign by Woman Suffragists*. H. M. Todd.

*ARENA. 2:175-81. June, 1900. *Real Case of the Remonstrants Against Woman Suffrage*. O. B. Frothingham.

*ATLANTIC MONTHLY. 65:310-20. March, 1890. *Woman Suffrage, Pro and Con*. Charles Worcester Clark.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY. 92:289-96. September, 1903. *Why Women Do Not Wish the Suffrage*. Lyman Abbott.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY. 105:297-301. March, 1910. *Change in the Feminine Ideal*. Margaret Deland.

*BIBLIOTHECA SACRA. 67:335-46. April, 1910. *Is Woman's Suffrage an Enlightened and Justifiable Policy for the State?* Henry A. Stimson.

*CENTURY. 48:613-23. August, 1894. *Wrongs and Perils of Woman Suffrage*. James M. Buckley.

CENTURY. 87:13-20. November, 1913. *Militant Women and Women*. E. Kenton.

*CHAUTAUQUAN. Vol. 13. April, 1891. *Why the Suffrage Should Not Be Granted to Woman*. Rose Terry Cooke.

CHAUTAUQUAN. 58:166-83. April, 1910. *Social Idealism and Suffrage for Women*. G. W. Cooke.

CHAUTAUQUAN. 59:84-9. June, 1910. *Anti-Suffrage Movement*. Mrs. B. Hazard.

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. 100:393-703. November, 1911. *Feminism and Politics*. T. Billington Greig.

*Quoted from in this Bulletin.

COLLIER'S. 45:22-4. August 20, 1910. *Women's Political Methods*. F. M. Bjorkman.

CURRENT LITERATURE. 48:177-9. February, 1910. *Wrong and Peril of Woman Suffrage*. J. M. Buckley.

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW. 36:398-404. November, 1908. *Some Suffragist Arguments*. Mrs. Humphrey Ward.

*FORUM. 43:495-504, 595-602. May and June, 1910. *Facts About Suffrage and Anti-Suffrage*. Mrs. Gilbert E. Jones.

GOOD HOUSEKEEPING. 57:215. August, 1913. *Handicap of Sex*. D. Dix.

HARPER'S WEEKLY. 55:6. December 2, 1911. *Objections to Woman Suffrage*.

HIBBERT JOURNAL. 9:275-95. June, 1911. *Woman Suffrage a New Synthesis*. G. W. Mullins.

LADIES' HOME JOURNAL. 27:21-2. February, 1910. *Why the Vote Would Be Injurious to Women*. L. Abbott.

LADIES' HOME JOURNAL. 30:23. January, 1913. *Feminine Unrest*. E. S. Martin.

LIPPINCOTT'S. 83:586-92. May, 1909. *Shall Women Vote?* Ouida. (Reprinted in condensed form in the Review of Reviews, 39:624-5. May, LITERARY DIGEST. 47:865-6. November 8, 1913. *Inferiority of Women*.)

LIVING AGE. 260:323-9. February 6, 1909. *Suffrage and Anti-Suffrage*. M. E. Simkins.

(The burden of the suffrage would come on the working-woman, who is unequal to the task.)

LIVING AGE. 261:240-3. April 24, 1909. "*Seems So*"—the Suffragettes. Stephen Reynolds.

(His main argument is that working-men and women do not desire the suffrage.)

NINETEENTH CENTURY. 61:227-36. February, 1907. *Women and Politics*. Caroline E. Stephen.

(Reprinted in full in Living Age. 252:579-86. March 9, 1907.)

NINETEENTH CENTURY. 61:595-601. April, 1907. *Women and Politics. Two Rejoinders*.

(Reprinted in full in Living Age. 253:271-6. May 4, 1907.)

*NINETEENTH CENTURY. 64:343-52. August, 1908. *Woman's Anti-Suffrage Movement*. Mary Augusta Ward (Mrs. Humphrey Ward).

(Reprinted in full in Living Age. 259:3-11. October 3, 1908.)

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 178:103-9. January, 1904. *Woman's Assumption of Sex Superiority*. Annie Nathan Meyer.

*NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 190:158-69. August, 1909. *Impediments to Woman Suffrage*. Mrs. Gilbert E. Jones.

*Quoted from in this Bulletin.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 191:549-58. April, 1910. *Woman's Relation to Government*. Mrs. William Forse Scott.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. 199:338-43. March, 1914. *Workings of Equal Suffrage*.

OUTLOOK. 68:353-5. June 8, 1901. *Rights of Man*. Lyman Abbott.

OUTLOOK. 75:737-44. November 28, 1903. *Woman's Suffrage in Colorado*. Elizabeth McCracken.

OUTLOOK. 90:848-9. December 19, 1908. *Theodore Roosevelt and Elihu Root on Woman's Suffrage*.

OUTLOOK. 93:868-74. December 18, 1909. *Melancholia and the Silent Woman*. Edwina Stanton Babcock.

OUTLOOK. 99:50. September 2, 1911. *Woman Suffrage on Trial*. W. Smith.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. 175:91-103. January, 1911. *Economic Criticism of Woman Suffrage*. C. H. Norman.

WORLD TODAY. 15:1061-6. October, 1908. *Should Women Vote?* Virginia B. LeRoy.

WHAT HAVE WOMEN DONE WITH THE VOTE?

By George Creel, Century Magazine, March, 1914.

Has equal suffrage made good? If so, the voting man desires to aid in its extension. Has equal suffrage failed? If so, he wants to fight its spread. This, in a word, is the mental attitude of the great mass of men in the thirty-six non-suffrage States. They are waiting to be "shown."

The first approach of the investigator who is searching for truth, and not endeavoring to obtain confirmation of previous prejudices, is through the statute books of the ten equal-suffrage States. These experiment stations, with the year in which they gave the vote to women, are: Wyoming, 1869; Colorado, 1893; Utah and Idaho, 1896; Washington, 1910; California, 1911; Oregon, Kansas and Arizona, 1912; Illinois and Alaska, 1913; Montana and Nevada, 1914.

What statutory enactments are admittedly due to the woman vote? In many respects this is the only fair approach. Laws speak for themselves, and that which is set down in black and white does not lend itself readily to distortion and misrepresentation. Do women avail themselves of the franchise privilege? Does the "bad" woman outvote her "good" sister? Have women become inveterate office-seekers? Has equal suffrage disrupted the home?

At the outset of the inquiry, Colorado and California suggest themselves as examples that may serve all purposes of computation and comparison. One has had suffrage for twenty years, the other for two. Colorado represents the old and its evolutions; California stands for the new, with its revolutions.

There is also this postulate to be accepted: *absolute segregation of the woman vote is impossible*. Men far outnumber the women in the eleven western equal-suffrage states, and the adoption of any law means that a certain portion of the male vote has given it the necessary approval. Reference to "women's laws," therefore, must be taken to mean those measures originated by women, introduced by women legislators, or else indorsed and lobbied for unflinchingly by women's organizations.

It is at this point that a break must be made in the recital of laws, for 1910 heard the first gun of Colorado's winning struggle for equal justice. Without entering into causes, suffice it to say that the people believed themselves outraged by a supreme court, enslaved by a "bipartizan machine," and pillaged by a *plunderbund* made up of public-service monopolies, railroads, smelters and various trusts.

Hard fighting wrenched the initiative and referendum from a venal legislature, and a vote in Denver for municipal ownership of the water plant marked the first defeat that the allied public-utility corporations had ever received.

In 1911 a commission government campaign was launched at various points in Colorado, and put into operation in Grand Junction, Colorado Springs, Pueblo, and various other municipalities. In Denver a corrupt council consigned a petition containing 10,000 signatures to the waste-basket. A citizens' movement was formed, a full mayoralty ticket placed in the field, and on May 21, 1912, the non-partizan candidates were overwhelmingly elected by 10,000 more votes than the combined totals of the Democratic and Republican parties.

In November, using the initiative for the first time, the people wrote these statutes and constitutional amendments: an eight-hour law for working-women; a mothers' compensation act; the recall of officials, with particular emphasis on the judiciary; state-wide civil service; an eight-hour law for miners; home rule for cities; the recall of decisions, providing that only the supreme court of the State shall have the power to declare laws unconstitutional, and that these decisions may be disapproved and set aside by a majority vote of the people; and the headless ballot.

In February, 1913, the long-delayed commission-government election was held, the change adopted, and on June 1 five commissioners, elected without party designations and by a preferential system of voting, took charge of Denver's affairs.

There can be no question that women were literally the life of the revolution, bringing an even greater degree of radicalism to bear upon the various propositions than the men. Judge Lindsey, speaking for the citizens; John H. Gabriel, president of the Direct Legislation League, and the writer, as chairman of the commission-government campaign, have never failed to say that the women, volunteering their services for the circulation of petitions, throwing open their homes when halls could not be hired, and as willing to trudge and drudge as to lead and sit in council, constituted the moving force of the forward movement.

In considering the laws enacted subsequent to 1910, mark the new economic and industrial emphasis: creation of a minimum-wage commission, with power to act; establishment of fifty dollars as a minimum monthly wage for teachers, and doubling the length of the minimum school year; amendments putting teeth in the child-labor law, the factory-inspection law, and the compulsory-education law; a workmen's compensation act; a law putting loan sharks

out of business, a strong non-support law, and a companion statute making non-support an extraditable offense; a state home for the feeble-minded; validating the wills of married women; perfecting the "honor-and-trust" system at the penitentiary in many particulars; making the "third degree" a felony, etc.

It is also important to note that a first act of the citizens' administration was the abolition of the infamous "red-light district," long protected by the bipartizan alliance.

In California the fight on commercialized vice has been waged chiefly in San Francisco, for Los Angeles abolished its infamous "crib district" in 1909 as the result of a scandal that exposed a city administration's intimate connection with the under-world.

San Francisco's answer to the Ruef-French restaurant infamies, however, was the creation of a municipal clinic for the purpose of segregating prostitutes and subjecting them to physical examination. It was against this condition specifically, but against the whole system generally, that the women revolted.

When the men declared that prostitution was a "necessary evil," the women asked them if they were willing to let a member of their own family recruit the industry. When the men said that a "wide-open town" was a good thing for business, and that tourists would avoid a "closed town," the women answered: "If drunkenness and debauchery are necessary to make business good, then the sooner we get rid of that sort of business the better. If tourists come to San Francisco only for whisky and lust, we don't want that class of travel near the homes in which we are rearing our children."

The city was forced to sever its relations with the clinic, whole sections of the vice district were cleansed, notably the Barbary Coast, and it was from these victories that the women of San Francisco joined with the womanhood of California in winning the injunction and abatement act from the legislature.

With regard to the liquor traffic, there can be no question that the voting woman is as bitterly opposed to the saloon as she is to the brothel. Kansas, of course, has had state-wide prohibition for years, and Colorado voted for state-wide prohibition in 1914; and Illinois at once extended the dry territory; and Nevada and Montana cannot yet be fairly counted either one way or the other. All the other eight, however, have local-option laws that are drying up the liquor like some huge blotter. Wyoming is ninety per cent. dry. Only eighteen of Utah's twenty-eight counties are "wet," and sixteen of these are mining-camps. Idaho, ninety per cent. dry, passed a search and seizure bill at the last session, also a law compelling an oath

from patrons of drug stores, and California's list of "dry" towns has grown from 200 odd to over 600 since suffrage.

In the matter of taking poverty out of the list of crimes, the equal-suffrage States lead easily. Colorado, California, Washington, Illinois, Idaho, Oregon, and Utah have mothers' pension laws that stop the cruel business of kidnaping children because the mother cannot earn enough to keep the wolf from the door. Only six non-suffrage states have adopted this humane measure. Idaho and Utah carry off first honors for generosity, both awarding ten dollars a month for the oldest child, but Utah allowing seven dollars per month for each additional child against Idaho's five dollars.

Child labor seems also to be a first consideration of the voting woman. Arizona is the one State in all the Union to adopt the model law framed by the National Child Labor Committee. California sets fifteen as the working age, and Washington, Colorado, Kansas, Utah, Illinois, and Oregon have well-nigh perfect laws. Fourteen years is the dead-line, fifteen years during the school term, and sixteen years in all dangerous trades.

Idaho lets down the bars to children of twelve—fourteen during school term—and Wyoming establishes the age limit of fourteen only for certain occupations, and then makes an exemption for poverty. These are the two rotten spots, and even the fact that child labor is not a pressing problem in either State will not serve as an excuse.

They shine white, however, by comparison with the sordid tragedies of Alabama, South Carolina, New Mexico, Georgia, and Mississippi, where babes of twelve are permitted to work incredible hours for incredible pittances. Or side by side with the cranberry boys of New Jersey, the glass factories of Pennsylvania, and the canneries of the Northern States.

Every one of the equal-suffrage States has a complete compulsory-education law, splendidly safeguarded and bulwarked by truant-schools and truant-officers, parental-delinquency, etc. Florida, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas* have no such law, and in Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, Louisiana, and Virginia the laws are utterly worthless.

It is distinctly noteworthy that in the list of the ten most illiterate States in the Union—Louisiana, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia—there is not an equal-suffrage State.

Minimum-wage laws are almost entirely peculiar to the equal-suffrage States. California, Colorado, Washington, Oregon, and

*Texas passed a compulsory education law in 1915.—Editor.

Utah have them, and *at work*. Massachusetts is the only non-suffrage State in their class.

The slightest analysis of these summaries, and their comparisons with non-suffrage States, develops certain facts instantly. The woman vote is definitely against the saloon, against commercialized vice, and against the theory that an "open" town helps business.

It is for more schools and better schools and compulsory education for the home in preference to the institution, and for the dignity and protection of motherhood in any and all circumstances. It is against the exploitation of the child, and for almost entire emphasis upon the corrective note in punishment rather than the punitive or deterrent.

Do women become inveterate office-seekers?

In Wyoming, where equal suffrage is forty-five years old, there are two members of the legislature and a number of women serving as county superintendents of schools. Mrs. Miller, one of the legislators, is the mother of grown sons, one of whom preceded her in the office; and the other, Miss Truax, a teacher, was petitioned to become a candidate as a protest against legislative delay in connection with school measures.

In Colorado, where the women have voted for twenty years, virtually all the educational offices have been turned over to them. Since 1895 the state superintendent of public instruction has been a woman, and today forty-three out of sixty-two counties have women for county superintendents of schools. Denver has a woman president of the election board, a woman member of the school board, and, prior to commission-government, had another able woman as clerk and recorder of deeds. A member of the board of regents of the State university is a woman, and throughout the State there are these women office-holders: two city auditors, eight city treasurers, three city clerks, ten county clerks, one county commissioner, twice as many as at any previous period in the twenty years.

In the state legislature in 1913 there were two women in the lower house and one in the senate, the latter re-elected in 1914. Mrs. Riddle is a German epitome of common sense who enjoys a competence through years of dairy farming. Mrs. Lee is the mother of grown children, and Mrs. Robinson, the senator, is an ex-college professor and a very brilliant writer.

In addition to these, two women serve on the state board of charities and corrections. Mrs. Helen Grenfell, as a member of the penitentiary board, has made penal reform possible, and there are women on the boards in charge of the various industrial homes.

Utah has three women in the legislature, and in Idaho the state

superintendent of public instruction is a woman, twenty-five out of thirty counties have women superintendents, a woman is on the board of regents, and there are about twenty county treasurers and auditors. Washington has two able women in the legislature.

Instead of being inveterate office-seekers, there is far more ground for a charge that the voting women have entirely failed and absolutely refused to show the interest in office-seeking and office-holding that is entailed by her percentage of the vote.

Has equal suffrage disrupted the home? As far as divorce statistics may be trusted, these show that Wyoming has 118 to every 10,000; Colorado, 158; Utah, 92; and Idaho, 120. It is questionable, however, whether they amount to anything. Utah has the lowest divorce rate in the Union, which might easily be turned into an argument for Mormonism. It is much more to the point that there is not an instance on record of a divorce arising from anything connected with the vote. This statement is laid down as a challenge.

There is now only the one remaining question to consider: Has the vote coarsened or cheapened women?

In Colorado, most attacked along this line, there is an Equal-Suffrage Aid Association composed of the most prominent men in the State, organized for the sole purpose of denying falsehoods and refuting slanders.

Senator Charles S. Thomas, also an ex-governor, Southern born, and the possessor of a voting wife and voting daughters, expressed the male sentiment of Colorado when he says: "The one offensive feature of equal suffrage has been the flood of blackguardly abuse heaped upon our women by foes of the movement. Scavengers, commissioned to attack and defame, have made pretense of studying our lives, thoughts, laws, and institutions between trains. The supposition that inclusion in the responsibilities of citizenship implies the instant degradation of our wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters can only proceed from mental perversion and degeneracy."

Bishop Spaulding of Utah, after long observation, declares that equal suffrage has developed better wives and better mothers, and that women have brought to their duties as citizens and legislators superior humanity and motherliness.

The Portland "Oregonian," unalterably conservative, admits editorially that equal suffrage has turned out to be one of the strongest fortifications of the home, and throughout his entire investigation the writer could not find anyone, not even a dethroned "boss," who would put his name to the charge that the vote had debased the women of his State.

The inevitable first result of equal suffrage is the removal of all

polling-places from the neighborhood of saloons. What was good enough for men is not good enough for their women folks. For the most part, voting-booths are in churches, parlors, corner groceries, or schools. Illinois had many of its polling-places decorated with potted plants, many Kansas towns introduced "no-smoking" regulations, and in all of the older equal-suffrage states there is yet to be recorded an instance of insult to women in connection with the franchise.

IS WOMAN SUFFRAGE IMPORTANT?

MAX EASTMAN.

With the advance of industrial art the work of women has gone from the house to the factory and market. Women have followed it there, and there they must do it until this civilization perishes. In 1900, approximately one woman in every five in the United States was engaged in gainful employment, and the number was increasing. Most of these women have no choice as to whether they will work or not, and many of them are working in circumstances corruptive of health and motherhood. It is, therefore, a vital problem for the future of our race, how to render the conditions of industry compatible with the physical and moral health of women. And to one who knows a little about human nature and the deep wisdom of representative government, it is clear that the only first step in solution of that problem is to give to the women themselves the dignity and defence of political recognition.

Compared to the variety of their needs and the subtlety of the disadvantages under which they enter a competitive system, it is a small thing to give them. But it is the first and manifest thing. It is the ancient antidote of that prejudice which everywhere opposes them, and its smallness is not a reason for withholding, but for bestowing it. Give them that small thing for which Anglo-Saxon men have groveled and lied and slaughtered and perished for a thousand years, to win—namely, a little bit of the personal sacredness of sovereigns before their rulers and the law. A small thing, but their own,—and an indispensable prerequisite and guarantee of every other privilege or opportunity you may hope to confer upon them.

Women have that guarantee in a male democracy, it is stated, through their husbands and fathers who represent them. And to an extent the statement is true. To an extent it is true, even when the husbands and fathers have none of that perfect loyalty to them which the statement assumes, for the habit of mind which democracy engenders in its officials involuntarily extends to their dealing with the unenfranchised. But there is a time when it is not true, and a

point where the habit of mind does not extend. And it is a crucial point for them—when as a class they, the unenfranchised workers, segregate themselves and dare to stand alone for their special aims in a labor organization. Then they are severed in our mind, as they are in fact, from any voter who might represent them; and then, above all, they need standing in the political system. For there are just two dependable guarantees of the effectiveness of an organization of people without wealth, and one is gunpowder and the other is the ballot.

“Why, the ballot never helped the working classes!” we hear it exclaimed. “*Organization* is the sole hope of labor!” But such ignorance of the history and significance of popular sovereignty is revealed in the exclamation, that one knows not with what kind of kindergarten instruction to begin to answer it. He has read nothing or he has read in vain of nineteenth century democracy, who thinks that labor organizations of males could have arrived where they are, in the respect of men and the law, if they had been unable to compel consideration from the State. It is *because* organization is the sole hope of labor that labor must have its portion of the sovereignty. And it is because, when united together for their special purposes, women lose even that second-hand sovereignty they are elsewhere alleged to have, that they must have a first-hand sovereignty. They must have a genuine guarantee that their needs shall be of consequence to the community they serve. Such certified consideration from the powers of law is both a symbol and a force indispensable to any group, or person, that either desires or is compelled by fortune, to enter the competitive world.

A hearing was recently held at Albany upon a bill to limit the hours of women’s labor. Twelve big employers appeared against the bill, stating that the working women do not want it. Five elected delegates from the working women’s organizations appeared in favor of the bill, stating that they do want it. No woman appeared against the bill. That was a drawn conflict of two vital interests in the State. The stronger and wealthier and better organized of those interests we clothe with the whole power and prestige of political citizenship, and the knowledge of political methods. The weaker and poorer and less organized we leave with no power and no standing in the community, and no political experience whatever. We let those employers come down to the Capitol and demand what they want from their representatives, and we make those workers come up and beg what they want from somebody else’s representatives. The idea of such a hearing upon such a bill ought to disgust every clear-minded Ameri-

can with this old-fashioned masculine pretense at representative government.

Such is the argument from the ideal of democracy, theoretic, practical, and coercive in the concrete present.—Yet, in so far as we are moral, in so far as we are believers in the progressive enrichment of life, we have something more to do than live up to our ideals. We have to illumine and improve them continually. The Athenian youths had a running-match in which they carried torches, and it was no victory to cross the tape with your torch gone out. Such is the race that is set before us. And we may well remember—we in America who scorn the contemplative life—that no amount of strenuousness with the legs will keep a flame burning while you run. You will have to be thinking.

And it is out of a thoughtful endeavor, not merely to live up to an ideal of ours, but to develop it greatly, that the suffrage movement derives its chief force. I mean our ideal of womanhood. It is not expected by the best advocates of this change that women will reform politics or purge society of evil, but it is expected, with reasoned and already proved certainty, that political knowledge and experience will benefit women. Political responsibility, the character it demands and the recognition it receives, will alter the nature and function of women in society to the improvement of themselves and their husbands and their children and their homes. Upon that ground we can declare that it is of vital importance to the advance of civilized life, not only to give the ballot to those women who want it, but to rouse those women who do not know enough to want it, to a better appreciation of the great age in which they live.

APPEAL OF POLITICS TO WOMAN

ROSAMOND LEE SUTHERLAND

(*North American Review*, 91:75-86. January, 1910.)

Why men, however ignorant or feeble-minded, just because they are men, should be credited with exclusively possessing a Heaven-bestowed ability of governing, to which women, whatever their training or mentality, may never aspire, must forever remain one of the unexplained mysteries. That even men are not all qualified for the ballot or entirely beyond criticism in its use might be suspected by the unregenerate from a perusal of the newspapers, say, at the time of the recent election in New York City, or any other large city, for that matter. When the ballot shall be given to women—as it is sure to be sooner or later—is it thinkable that any of them will make a worse use of it than some men are now doing? On the other hand,

is it not quite possible, indeed, is it not probable, that there will be an improvement?

It has been argued adversely that to give the ballot to women would but double the vote without affecting the result, as most women would follow the party convictions of father or husband, but if danger of doubling the vote through a tendency to follow a husband's or father's footsteps is a valid objection to giving the franchise to women, then as a general proposition a man's sons should not be given a vote for the same reason. Our politics, as well as our religion, are, after all, largely matters of inheritance and environment, and if the objection is good, there should be but one voter in the family—the head of the household. If death has removed the father, for example, the mother is, or should be, the head of the house and the property owner. Why should she not, then, be the one to cast the vote? It might really be a better plan than the present system under which large property interests must often go wholly unrepresented, except on the tax list, until a son becomes of age.

AUSTRALIAN WOMAN AND THE BALLOT

ALICE HENRY.

(*North American Review*, December 26, 1906. 183:1272-9.)

The argument that women will not vote is completely disproved by Australian experience. They not only vote, but they vote in continually increasing numbers as time goes on, and they become educated up to a sense of their political responsibilities and all that these imply. Not all the States discriminate in their returns between men and women voters, but those that do, show something like the following: In South Australia, at the last general election, 59 per cent of the men on the rolls voted, and 42 per cent of the women. In Western Australia 49 per cent of the men and 47 per cent of the women voted. At the last federal election 56 per cent of the men voted, and 40 per cent of the women. None of the Australian States has yet reached the extraordinary record of New Zealand, where, in 1902, nearly 75 per cent of the women electors recorded their votes, as against 76 per cent of their brothers.

It is unnecessary to add that the conservative woman votes. Her husband or father and their newspaper take good care that the duty of doing so is well impressed upon her, even though abstractly they may all three disapprove of woman in politics, and have striven to avert her appearing in that arena as much as they possibly could.

In the legislative world the trend of the laws whose passage has

been brought about, or hastened, by the direct political action of women is very clear. These constitute, largely, measures to remove disabilities from women and improve the condition of children, particularly homeless and neglected children. It is probably true that very few measures cannot be named which cannot sooner or later be obtained in other countries by the old, slow, indirect methods; but it is quite certain that there is no country which can point to such a series of reforms brought about in such a short time, with so little friction and with such a minimum expenditure of energy—energy thus left free to take up newer problems and fresh educational work. Among the measures that can be traced to woman suffrage within the last ten years are many acts improving children's conditions by extending juvenile courts, limiting hours of work, providing better inspection, forbidding sale of drink, drugs, etc., to children.

In South Australia, where the women have been longest enfranchised, the care of neglected children is better understood, and the oversight of such children (under a state department) better controlled, than elsewhere. It was the first country in the world to have a legally constituted juvenile court. The New South Wales and Tasmania courts were among the first results of enfranchising women, while in Victoria (where alone the women do not possess the state franchise) a measure for establishing juvenile courts is still, after years of agitation, in the stage of a much-debated and very defective bill.

That the welfare of the general community is subserved by the co-operation of women electors is seen by the adoption of some more general measures, such as the laws dealing with the drink traffic, the gambling evil, and the sale of drugs (the importation of opium, for instance, except as specially prepared for medical purposes, being by federal enactment entirely forbidden, throughout the Commonwealth). On all these points the experience of Australia during the last ten years has been the same as that of New Zealand for thirteen years. The power of the best men in the community has been reinforced, and the hands of conscientious legislators strengthened by the addition of the woman's vote.

WHY MAN NEEDS WOMAN'S BALLOT

CLIFFORD HOWARD.

It will be found that many of the prejudices and arguments against woman suffrage are based upon conditions that no longer exist. Our nation has moved forward with such prodigious speed, that only the

most nimble-witted among us have been able to keep pace with it. While we are today riding in automobiles and electric cars, the ideas of the great majority of us are still traveling by stage coach. And thus it happens that many of the arguments in opposition to woman suffrage are today as thoroughly out of date and ridiculous and old-fashioned as is the hoop skirt. Would we discuss the subject intelligently we must regard it in the light of present-day conditions; we must realize the tremendous transformation that has taken place in our social and economic conditions within the past two generations.

Fifty years ago, for example, there was but one woman's college in America, and that was not much more than a seminary. Today there are a hundred and fifty women's colleges, to make no mention of the many co-educational institutions. Seventy per cent of the graduates of our high schools are girls, and today there are more young women preparing for college than there are men. In the educational status of woman, therefore, there has been a most remarkable change. Our fathers opposed woman suffrage on the ground that the women were not deserving and were not capable of a liberal education, and behold! today the women are fast becoming the better educated half of society.

Sixty years ago there was not a woman physician in the United States. Today there are more than eight thousand of them. There was not a woman lawyer; today there are nearly three thousand. There was not a woman clergyman; today there are nearly six thousand. And so with all the professions and technical callings. In our fathers' day none of these was open to the women. The women were not considered capable of filling them.

Sixty years ago there were but five or six occupations open to women—teaching, sewing, house-cleaning, and the like—and, all told, there were but a comparatively few thousand women who were earning their own living. Today there are more than three hundred occupations open to women, and there are today upward of six million women who are supporting themselves by their own labor.

In the face of this tremendous fact, what becomes of the one-time argument that women were not capable of supporting themselves? Our fathers could not have conceived of the coming of a time when the industrial, the commercial, the business life of this nation would be vitally dependent upon the labor of women. Were the women to withdraw from the industrial work today and return to the conditions of fifty years ago, the nation would collapse. The business and commercial world would be thrown into a state of chaos.

Fifty years ago there was not a woman's club in existence. Today there are more than eight thousand of them, with a total membership

in excess of two million women. It was contended a generation or two ago that woman had no capacities for organization or for collective work. What weight has an argument today based upon that contention?

We are today the witnesses not only of an evolution, but a revolution, in the social and economic status of the woman. And what is true in reference to woman is true also in reference to our nation as a whole. Seventy years ago there was not a city in the Union with a population equal to that of Los Angeles today. New York had a population of a bare three hundred thousand, and that was three times greater than that of any other city of the time. Chicago was a mere village, with four or five thousand inhabitants. Altogether there were but five cities with a population of more than fifty thousand. Today we have fifty cities with a population of more than a hundred thousand; we have a hundred cities with a population of over fifty thousand, and we have seventeen cities with a population greater than that of New York in 1841.

These tremendous increases in city population, these vast aggregations of people in hundreds of places, together with the changes wrought by invention and the onmove of national progress and expansion, involve social and political problems wholly beyond the concepts of our forefathers. We have to deal today with conditions absolutely unique. The city, for example, is no longer a mere political corporation with interests wholly distinct and apart from personal and domestic problems. In point of fact, the modern city is a big, co-operative housekeeping business.

One after another the duties that formerly belonged exclusively to the individual households have become the common duties of the community—the care and protection of children; their schooling and physical training; the regulation of morals and health and cleanliness; the supervision of food, the inspection of buildings, the prevention of disease, the regulation of drainage and sanitation, and a score of other like duties. All of these are essentially domestic. Primarily, they all relate to the welfare of the child, the home, the family; and yet more and more are they becoming the chief concern of the city and of the nation; and more and more it is becoming evident that in the proper management of these duties we require the assistance of the woman.

For we must remember that these are really women's duties. They have merely been transferred from the individual family to the bigger municipal family.

That there has come a radical change in our domestic conditions does not affect the natural instincts of the woman. She is still the

woman, with the self-same powers and capabilities and desires. The only difference is that today these functions must find their expression under different conditions, under different auspices. And that is precisely what is happening. With the constant lessening of individual household duties, with the decrease in the size of families, and with the increased efficiency and capacity of women, the alert, progressive woman of today finds her housekeeping instinct extending to the municipality and her instinct of motherhood to the children of the whole nation. She is still maternal, and will ever remain so, and the home is still her sphere.

When the anti-suffragists declare that the woman's place is the home we grasp them by the hand and say amen most earnestly. The woman's place is the home. But today would she serve the home she must go beyond the house. No longer is the home compassed by four walls. Many of its most important duties lie now involved in the bigger family of the city and State.

In the matter of schooling, for example, not only does the public government supervise the studies of the children and provide them with the traditional routine book knowledge, but today it is taking the little tots from the mother and teaching them in the kindergarten, and the older children are being taught music, and sewing, and cooking, and domestic economy, and manual arts, and trades-subjects of instruction which but a few years ago were matters of private and individual concern and subject to the direct supervision of the mother. Today, therefore, this one-time home duty can be exercised only by taking an interest and a part in government administration. It has passed from the individual home to the community home.

So also, in the matter of food. Today the woman cannot exercise any direct, personal supervision over the production of the necessities of life. If she would assure herself that the flour, the bread, the meat, the milk, the canned goods and the prepared foodstuffs of all kinds that come into her house are wholesome and pure and fit to eat and are served in correct measure, she must see that the State and city laws with reference to the production and disposal of food are being properly enforced and properly complied with.

And so, again, in matters of morals and health. Are the streets in proper condition? Are the alleys kept clean? Is the garbage properly collected? Is the city water fit to drink? Is the drainage in good order? Are the children protected from contamination in the public schools and in places of public amusement? They are essentially home matters, family matters, but they can be attended to today only through public channels.

We see, therefore, that if the woman of today would exercise her

natural prerogative as the guardian of the home, she must of necessity interest herself in public affairs and take a part in their management. The woman who today remains quietly and passively within her own household, contenting herself with the assurance that she is doing what her grandmother and her mother did before her, is grossly deceiving herself. She is not doing what her grandmother did; she is not attending to the duties and the cares and the responsibilities that fell to the lot of the women of two generations ago. She is not fully serving her home, because so many of her duties are no longer to be found within the immediate home. Would she serve the individual family, she must serve at the same time the bigger family, of which her own is today but a part.

EXPERIENCE WITH WOMAN SUFFRAGE

WINIFRED SMITH

As to Colorado, perhaps the verdict of a casual visitor to the State eight years ago, when the women there had been enfranchised only five years, is negligible by this time, or at least should be revised to date. Such a revision your readers would find in an article by Judge Ben Lindsey in the February, 1911, number of the "Delin-eator." In this paper the author lists no less than twenty-six excellent laws passed in the thirteen years of woman suffrage in the State, laws which he considers are due to the women voters. Moreover, any one who read of the hearing of the Suffrage Bill before the New York legislature last winter, and who remembers how Judge Lindsey, in a two-hour speech, refuted, point by point, the superficial inaccuracies in Mr. Richard Barry's anti-suffrage article in the "Ladies' Home Journal," will possibly hesitate to condemn the experiment in Colorado as an absolute failure. Should the testimony of one citizen, even of so eminent and just a man as the "children's Judge," seem inadequate, let me refer you to the results of the questionnaire sent by the late Julia Ward Howe shortly before her death to all the Protestant ministers in four suffrage states, asking for their unbiased opinion as to the effects of the feminine votes. Out of the very large number of answers, some four hundred in all, the great majority were enthusiastically favorable to the unlimited franchise, a small number thought there had been no great change in politics for better or for worse, a very few—I regret that I have not the exact figures here—said they had discovered a few bad effects. Most suffragists would, I am sure, be willing to grant that thirteen years is too short for any reform to prove its absolute value, but most would add that within that time some valuable results must have been apparent,

else five other states—neighbors to those already enfranchised—would not be on the point of submitting a woman suffrage amendment to the people.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO

(Extracts from the conclusions reached by HELEN L. SUMNER in her book, "Equal Suffrage in Colorado.")

The influence of equal suffrage in Colorado over the machinery of party politics, though apparently not great, has probably been beneficial. Women have been slack, even more so than men, in the fulfillment of political duties other than voting. Few of them attend caucuses or primaries, but more serve as delegates to conventions, and their presence has a slight tendency to improve political platforms and the selection of candidates. "Planks" are sometimes introduced to "catch the woman vote," but they are no more lived up to than the planks introduced to catch other classes of votes. Saloon-keepers and men of questionable personal morality are usually, but not always, tabooed as candidates. This, however, does not necessarily improve the standard of public efficiency or honor.

Women have shown their capacity for breaking away from party lines when moral issues became apparent. They need only the right kind of nominating machinery in order to express their rightful influence within party lines. It is no reflection, then, on equal suffrage to show woman's incapacity to cope with the existing machinery of nominations. Equal suffrage, indeed, serves to show, in the most striking way, the essential rottenness and degrading character of the existing system.

Though they have gained in their proportion of county superintendents and members of school boards, the women of Colorado seem in other directions, since the early years of equal suffrage, to have lost ground in the distribution of elective offices. This is due, however, not to any record of dishonesty or inefficiency in office, but to three factors of an entirely different nature. First, there are many men who have a hankering for office; they are more experienced, and often less scrupulous politicians than women; and they are upheld by a powerful public opinion of both sexes that the women should not take the man's job. Second, there are comparatively few women who desire office; those who do so are frequently deterred by distaste for the methods required to secure it; and they are seriously handicapped by the discovery that other women in voting cling much closer to party than to sex lines. Third, the normal political and economic motives were at first somewhat obscured by the uncer-

tain element of the woman vote, and the men were not sure but that they would be obliged to yield many offices in order to keep the new voters under the party whip. As things have settled down, however, they have discovered that the offices given to women may be quite narrowly limited without materially endangering the party supremacy.

The record of women in office is high. It is difficult to secure an adequate measure of the efficiency and honesty of individual office-holders, but the general opinion prevails that women have given, as a Weld County man put it, "more attention to business and less to wire-pulling than men." There is no record of a woman defaulter, though men defaulters in county and city offices have been distressingly common. Women office-holders have sometimes been accused of graft and of accepting bribes, but this has been only when charges of bribery and graft have been floating around in such numbers as to hit any one who stood in the limelight. No such charge has ever been taken seriously enough to go beyond the opposition newspapers, and in only two or three cases have such accusations even gone beyond private conversation. In short, the record of women office-holders on the score of honesty is considerably above that of men office-holders.

Again, no woman has shown herself grossly inefficient in office, and several have made brilliant records—one, at least, attaining national eminence by reason of her excellent administration of the office of state superintendent of public instruction. In the matter of efficiency, then, women have made, on an average, better records than men. Their privilege of holding official positions has, moreover, brought out and developed talents which would otherwise have remained dormant, and so have been lost to the State. It is unfortunate, however, that men and women rarely compete for the same office, because segregation along sex lines tends to hamper the selection of the fittest candidate. But, upon the whole, the administration of women in public office has been at least as successful, and, all things considered, probably more so than the administration of men.

The economic effect of equal suffrage during the first dozen years of its existence in Colorado has evidently been slight. The only clearly demonstrable results, indeed, appear to have been the opening up to women of a few new avenues of employment, such as political canvassing and elective offices, their employment in somewhat greater numbers as clerks and stenographers in public offices, and the equalizing in most public positions of their salaries with those of men doing the same work. But the positions are graded, and men are given the best-paid places. The average wages, even of women teachers, are still decidedly lower than those of men teachers.

It should be noted, moreover, that twelve years is entirely too short a time for the influence of equal suffrage over economic conditions to have fully developed. To a certain extent this is true of its influence in other directions. But its effect, for instance, on the character of candidates nominated for office is direct, while it has almost unlimited possibilities of influencing economic life indirectly through legislation. The results of this opportunity are necessarily of slow development.

It is safe to say that the most conspicuous effect of equal suffrage has been upon legislation, and, though it is impossible to prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that the woman's club movement would not have brought about the passage of the same laws, it seems probable that the votes of women have affected the desired end with less effort and in less time than would have been required in non-suffrage States. When they were first enfranchised their influence may have been slightly stronger than at present, as they were then politically an unknown quantity, and the men, in order to win their votes, may have yielded more than later experience proved necessary. But they are still, to a certain extent, an unknown factor, as they split their tickets more often than men. For this reason, political bosses, as well as saloon men, are usually opposed to equal suffrage. They have never been known to favor "prize fight" bills, or other laws of vicious tendency, and not more than twenty persons, in answering any of the questions relating to the effect of equal suffrage on legislation, expressed the opinion that it had been bad.

Although the Colorado laws for the protection of working women and children might be greatly strengthened, and although the experience of older States furnishes a warning that such legislation should be enacted, if it is not to encounter grave difficulties, before urgent occasion for it has arisen, it is fair to say that, in other respects, no State has a code of laws better adapted to its immediate need for the protection of women and children, and that the influence of the enfranchised women has distinctly strengthened the cause of reform in this particular. The direct influence of women who have taken active part has been one factor, but the indirect influence of the merely voting woman, by materially strengthening the backing of the men who have stood for reform measures in the interest of women and children, has been even more powerful.

The influence of the social settlements and of the juvenile court is, of course, potent in securing many of the reforms which settlement workers have also secured in other States and cities. But the proportion of women interested in these matters is almost everywhere larger than the proportion of men, and in Colorado there is inevit-

ably, in the consideration of such questions, a tendency to yield to the wishes of that large element of the political constituency, the women. This tendency is not as great as might be wished, and there are sometimes other more powerful interests to be conciliated. Whenever a Colorado woman, however, makes a demand in which she may reasonably be supposed to have the silent backing of the great mass of women who do not talk, but vote, she inevitably has far less difficulty in obtaining her object than her sisters of the non-suffrage States. The possession of the ballot economizes for her both effort and time.

The effect of equal suffrage upon the women themselves, their outlook upon life, and their relationship to the home, is, in the opinion of many, the crux of the problem. Its effect upon party politics has been slight. But the reason is to be found primarily in the character of the present political machinery.

Over the majority of women it is readily evident that equal suffrage has exercised a good influence, and one which inevitably reacts, to a certain extent, upon political life. It has tended, for instance, to cultivate intelligent public spirit among the women of Colorado. Many have not been aroused; many have become discouraged and lost interest after the failure of their early efforts; comparatively few have taken an active part in political life; but thousands vote, and to every one of these thousands the ballot means a little broadening in the outlook, a little glimpse of wider interests than pots and kettles, trivial scandal, and bridge whist.

As for the loss in womanly characteristics, sometimes alleged to have resulted, it is difficult to find any evidence to show that voting affects this side of a woman's character any more than purchasing a garden hose. Families usually go to the polls together, old and young, men and women. In Pueblo, in 1906, one woman one hundred and two years old cast her first ballot. Many mothers have cast their first ballots with sons just arrived of age. Women at the polls meet, not rough and unfamiliar persons, but their own neighbors and friends. In political conventions they often exchange recipes for cooking egg-plant and choice information about the baby, the servant and the dress-maker, just as they would at any other gathering.

There are, it is true, a thousand and one psychological points in which women differ more or less decidedly from men, and their enfranchisement has probably tended to slightly modify some of these points of difference in some women. Social divisions, for instance, sometimes impede women's political work. They are not usually as democratic as men, primarily because they do not have as much

occasion in their daily lives to associate with other classes than their own. But to assert that equal suffrage is capable of destroying real womanliness is to assert that the characteristics which make women women and men men are only skin deep. As for man's chivalry, one woman remarked rather pathetically that she never knew what real chivalry meant until she could vote, and there are doubtless many others who have had the same experience. The fundamental emotional characteristics of men and women, whether good or bad, are far too deeply rooted to be subverted by the franchise privilege.

Equal suffrage has brought them practically no loss and some decided gain, the latter mainly evident in the effect of the possession of the ballot upon the women of Colorado. It has enlarged their interests, quickened their civic consciousness, and developed in many cases ability of a high order which has been of service to the city, the county and the State. Closely allied to this wider outlook and richer opportunity, and also distinctly visible as at least a tendency, is a development of a spirit of comradeship between the sexes. It is still too early to measure adequately these factors, and perhaps it will never be possible to determine exactly how much equal suffrage has contributed. But the Colorado experiment certainly indicates that equal suffrage is a step in the direction of a better citizenship, a more effective use of the ability of women as an integral part of the race, and a closer understanding and comradeship between men and women.

MEASURING UP EQUAL SUFFRAGE

An Authoritative Estimate of Results in Colorado by
GEORGE CREEL and JUDGE BEN B. LINDSEY.

Colorado, better, perhaps, than any other State, affords an opportunity for a fair appraisal of equal suffrage's value, of its merits and demerits, its efficiency or its failure. This commonwealth is peculiarly suited for such an examination by reason of the typical Americanism that marks its people and its problems.

If the matter were pinned down to a specific result, and discussion limited to one concrete outcome, equal suffrage could well afford to rest its case on the findings of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. This globe-circling organization of men and women, who play important parts in the public affairs of their various countries is on record as declaring that "Colorado has the sanest, the most humane, the most progressive, most scientific laws relating to the child to be found in any statute books in the world." And of these laws which drew such praise from impartial sociologists, not one but has come into operation since Colorado's adoption of equal suffrage in 1893;

not one but owes either its inception or its success to the voting woman. Even in those cases where the law was not originated, not specifically championed by them, they elected the official responsible for the law, and whose candidacy had its base in revolt and reform.

The list is as long as splendid: laws establishing a State home for dependent children, three of the five members of the board to be women; making mothers joint guardians of their children with the fathers; raising the age of protection for girls to eighteen years; creating juvenile courts; making education compulsory for all children between the ages of eight and sixteen, except the ailing, those taught at home, those over fourteen who have completed the eighth grade, those who support themselves, or whose parents need their help and support; establishing truant or parental schools; forbidding the insuring of the lives of children under ten; making it a criminal offense for parents or other persons to contribute to the delinquency of children; forbidding children of sixteen or under to work more than eight hours a day in any mill, factory or store or in any other occupation that may be deemed unhealthful; requiring that at least three of the six members of the Board of County Visitors be women; establishing a State Industrial Home for Girls, three of the five members of the Board of Control to be women, including instruction concerning the humane treatment of animals in the public school course; providing that any person employing a child under fourteen in any mine, smelter, mill, factory or underground works, shall be punished by imprisonment in addition to fine; abolishing the binding out of industrial home girls until twenty-one, and providing for parole; forbidding prosecuting and arresting officers from collecting fees in cases against children; providing that at least two thousand dollars of the estate of a deceased parent shall be paid to the child before creditors' claims are satisfied.

These laws, directly concerned with the welfare of the child, are supplemented by the following safeguards thrown about motherhood, the home, and general sociological conditions:

Laws making father and mother joint heirs of deceased children; requiring joint signature of husband and wife to every chattel mortgage, sale of household goods used by the family, or conveyance or mortgage of homestead; making it a misdemeanor to fail to support aged or infirm parents; providing that no woman shall work more than eight hours a day at labor requiring her to be on her feet; requiring one woman physician on the board of the insane asylum; providing for the care of the feeble-minded, for their free maintenance, and for the inspection of private eleemosynary institutions by the State Board of Charities; making the Colorado Humane So-

ciety a State bureau of child and animal protection; enforcing pure food inspection in harmony with the national law; providing that foreign life or accident insurance companies, when sued, must pay the costs; establishing a State Traveling Library Commission to consist of five women from the State Federation of Women's Clubs; and making it a criminal offense to fail, refuse or neglect to provide food, clothing, shelter and care in case of sickness of wife or minor child.

The woman voter has boldly and intelligently dealt with the "criminal problem," the "labor problem," and the "suffrage problem." Not only has the "indeterminate sentence" been written on the statute books, and probation laws of greatest latitude adopted, but women serving on the penitentiary and reform school boards have practically revolutionized the conduct of penal institutions in Colorado. Broken men are mended now, not further cowed and crushed. A State Free Employment Bureau, with offices in all Colorado cities of more than twenty-five thousand, has worked wonders, and the bitter cry of the unemployed is less and less heard; and women have largely engineered the effective campaign in favor of direct legislation, and have been almost solidly behind the fight for the initiative and referendum, the direct primary, and the commission form of government.

At the last Denver election, held May 27, 1910, both Republican and Democratic parties were compelled to recognize the popular demand, and present charter amendments providing for the initiative, referendum, recall, and a water commission. But, under the control of public service corporations, and practically financed by the water monopoly, which was asking for a new franchise, "fake" amendments were framed by the old parties. Skillful indeed was the wording—every amendment "looked good"—yet not one but had a "joker" in it. At the last moment a Citizens' Party took the field, women behind it, and a woman on the ticket. Real initiative, referendum, and recall amendments were prepared, and a distinguished water commission named with power to either buy the water company's plant at a fixed figure, or build a new one.

Against both organizations, corporation money, and every professional politician and party henchmen, the Citizens' ticket won an overwhelming victory. Denver now possesses the initiative, referendum and recall; and by virtue of a bond issue carried September 6, 1910, Denver will build its own water plant, and be forever freed from as arrogant and rapacious a monopoly as ever cursed a community.

And the women voters led!

Equal suffrage has been one of the great first causes of these laws,

reforms and revolt. Surely, in the face of such results, fair-minded people must be shown a tremendous counter-balancing of injury and evil before they can justly condemn the movement. And what is it that the anti-equal suffragists chiefly urge? That "it destroys the home."

Since it is admittedly the case that equal suffrage has safeguarded the home by scientific laws, and sweetened and bettered communal conditions directly bearing upon the home, this charge must be regarded as specifically leveled at the women in the home. In fact, the more blackguardly critics have not hesitated to declare that "the character of the Colorado woman is steadily deteriorating under the influence of the ballot."

It is, of course, a charge that defies detailed proof. To those who have visited Colorado, admired the conjunction of taste and care that marks the Colorado home, and rejoiced in the intelligence and refinement of the State's womanhood, the slander is at once apparent. To others the only thing that can be offered is a flat denial from every Colorado man.

Why, in the name of reason, should the mere fact of voting work deterioration in any woman? It does not take any mother "away from her home duties" to spend ten minutes going to the polls, casting her vote, and returning to the bosom of her family, but during those ten minutes she wields a power that is doing more to protect her home, and all other homes, than any other possible influence.

SHALL OUR MOTHERS, WIVES AND SISTERS BE OUR EQUALS OR OUR SUBJECTS?

FRANK PARSONS

(Arena: 49:92-4. July, 1908.)

Sex has no essential relation to suffrage. The reasoning on which the case of manhood suffrage rests is that the ballot is necessary as a protection against injustice, and very desirable as a means of education and development. These reasons apply to women as well as men. The only limitations placed on manhood suffrage relate to age, intelligence, character, and interests, or residence and identification with the country sufficient to justify the interference of interest, and these should be the only limitations placed upon woman suffrage. Inconsistency is supposed to be feminine, but consistency is not a prevalent virtue even with men. We make a vigorous statement of inherent and inalienable rights and would fly to arms if any one denied us political liberty and equality, yet we deny those sacred rights to those within our power. We declare that taxation without

representation is tyranny, but tax numbers of women directly and practically the whole mass of women indirectly without representation in either case, so we are self-confessed tyrants unless it is understood that there is a mental reservation to the effect that it must be man who is taxed without representation or there is no tyranny. We affirm the governments derive their just powers from consent of the governed, but exclude the consent of half of the governed. We boast of our liberty and hold the best part of the people in subjection. We proclaim a republic and ignore the fact that no real republic can exist where half of the people of full age and discretion, character and interest have no part in the elections, and though they have to obey the laws are allowed no voice in making them. We gave the suffrage to millions of unprepared slaves, and claimed it for ourselves (or our ancestors did, and we approve the act, with some slight modifications, perhaps) centuries before we knew much about using it, believing the use the best means of developing fitness for use, and yet we deny suffrage to women because they are not familiar with politics. We permits the slums of New York and Chicago to vote, but deny the privilege to such women as Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Mary A. Livermore, Jane Addams, Clara Barton and a host of the best minds on earth, on the ground that women do not know enough to vote. We allow a multitude of men to vote who are exempt from military duty, and yet deny the right to women because they cannot fight, and even Herbert Spencer deems this argument conclusive. We give the suffrage to millions of men who do not care enough for it to use it, and yet deny it to women because some of them do not wish to vote. With our brothers over the sea a woman may sit on a throne, but is not permitted to sit in Parliament.

Justice seems to say: "Put the age of discretion where experience indicates the reasonable average to be, and make the requirements as to character, intelligence and interest what you please. Then if women come up to the requirements, let them vote, and if men do not come up to the requirements, refuse them the ballot. To be just is to treat all persons alike under the same essential circumstances, and sex has nothing to do with the reasons on which the suffrage rests. Women are as much entitled as men to education, development, influence, and protection afforded by the ballot. Exclude women who prove to be unfit in the light of impartial and relevant tests, but do not class the whole sex with infants, idiots, criminals, Indians, aliens and paupers."

In four of our states and in New Zealand women have the full suffrage, and its exercise has been attended with none of the evils

predicted by its opponents, but with beneficial results so marked as to call forth emphatic statements in its favor by leading legislators, judges of the highest courts, and other leading officials who affirm that woman suffrage has tended strongly to purify politics, improve the character of nominations and aid the enforcement of the law. The approval of equal suffrage is all but universal where it has been tried, almost the only exception being the case of some, would-be politician who might get what he wants if it were not for the women's vote, or in the case of an individual like the man from Wyoming, who declared that woman suffrage was a failure in that State, but when they looked up his record they found he had carried the ball and chain for an unpleasant period in consequence of the verdict of a jury of women.

In Kansas and in England women enjoy the right of municipal suffrage; and in twenty-five of our States they have the school suffrage. There is no doubt that the full suffrage already adopted in four of our States will come in all. Certainly there is much need for its adoption and need of the most vital moment.

The laws and governments made by men have not been fair to women or children. By the common law a married woman has no property rights, nor any legal existence. Husband and wife are one, and the husband is the one. A married woman is a *femme covert*, or a woman under the cover or wing of her husband, and being so hidden, the common law cannot see her, but recognizes the husband as the only personality in the sight of the law. In Shakespeare's day a woman practically belonged to her husband, the same as his horse or dog, except that he could not kill her suddenly. In the early part of this century, it is said that a man in England led his wife to market with a rope about her neck and sold her in the street, getting more for the rope than for the woman. Blackstone says that a man may give his wife moderate correction, but I have hunted in vain through Blackstone to find a similar right granted woman against her husband. It must be admitted, however, that the law is not without its compensations, as may be seen by the case of darkey Reuben, who made a complaint against his wife for beating him, and got her convicted and fined, whereupon, she having no money, he had to pay the fine himself.

Miss Diana Hirschler, in her address at the Washington suffrage convention a few years ago, cites an old writer as saying: "If a man beat an outlaw, a traitor, a pagan or his wife, it is dispunishable, for by the Law Common these can have no action," adding very appropriately, "God grant gentle woman better support and better company." The fact is, that women were formerly thought

of by men as their property, and the denial of civic and legal rights was the natural consequence of their conception. With the growth of enlightenment the law has been changed by statute in many respects, but the continued denial of civic inequality is a persistent remnant of the conception born of a barbarous age, that woman belongs to man. Even the lighter disabilities were slow in going, and are not all gone yet. Only a generation ago a man in Massachusetts married a woman who had \$50,000 in personalty. He took possession of it, as he had a legal right to do, and then made a will providing that in case of his death the lady should have the *income* from the \$50,000 during her life, *provided* she did not marry again. In Massachusetts and other states a woman can now control her property, for the most part. But the laws are still in many respects unjust. Joint earnings and funds belong to the husband absolutely, so that if a wife allows her money or her personalty to become mixed with her husband's she loses legal control of it. In about one-third of our states the husband can appropriate his wife's earnings just as he can take the earnings of his horse and wagon. In all but eight of our states the mother is still denied an equal right with the father to the control of their children. The laws of divorce are not impartial. The laws of descent of property are not equal. A widow's dower affects only a *third* of the realty of her husband, while a widower's courtesy relates to the *whole* of his wife's real estate. Children under man-made laws are left to fester by thousands in an atmosphere pestilent with immoral and criminal influences, left to "soak and blacken soul and body in the slime of city slums." In many of our states the law makes no effective effort to remove the saloon, the gambling-den and the brothel from the path of youth, nor to banish the poisonous cigarette or the still more poisonous "literature" of sensationalism and immorality. It is time the women had a chance to see what they can do. They make home pure and beautiful. They can make our streets and cities pure and beautiful also. Their sovereignty in the home is beneficent; their sovereignty in the state will be no less so.

It is the right of woman to use not only the power of persuasion, but the power of the ballot to protect herself and her children. The ballot is the point at which intelligence and moral sentiment take hold upon action and mold institutions and laws. Woman has a right to this most effective means of transforming the social environment into greater fitness for the highest life of herself and all her loved ones. It is the right of woman also to enjoy the educating and developing effects of civic responsibilities.

It is the right of man that woman shall vote in order that his com-

panionship with her may be lifted to the plane of equality, and blessed with a new development, a new element of power and thought and sympathy. What man would have his wife and daughters subjects instead of equals? What man would deny to his mother the right he claims for himself? It is a man's right to have his children born and reared by women who have had full advantage of development and who understand the world and conditions under which their children will live.

It is the right of children, living and unborn, to have the ennobled motherhood and the more excellent training that will come with a symmetrical, well-rounded, fully developed womanhood. It is the right of every citizen to be born and reared by a sovereign citizen and not by a subject. It is the right of every child that the mothers of the land shall have the power to banish vicious influences from the social and political environment in which the child must live, the power to bring the force and wisdom of the mother-love to bear directly upon civic affairs to purify and invigorate the civic and social atmosphere the child must breathe throughout its formative years.

It is the right of society to have the purest force in the world put into action in political life. It is the right of society to have the virtue, love and devotion of womanhood crystallized into law. Women are far less influenced by the commercial spirit than men. Commercialism is the danger of our time. The despotism of the dollar is the threat of the future. The power of women in politics would be of incalculable value in the resistance it would offer to the domination of the mercantile spirit, and the conscienceless pursuit of gain. Women have a higher regard for principle than men. They love justice and mercy. They are against oppression. They would favor peace even if trade should suffer. They would banish the slums and make cities beautiful. Their gentleness, sympathy, refinement and incorruptibility are sadly needed in our politics; their nobility should be registered in our statutes.

RIGHT AND EXPEDIENCY OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE

GEORGE F. HOAR.

(Century, 48:605-13. August, 1894.)

There are a great many things women are not expected to do. There are a great many things that no doctor of divinity or college professor, or very old man or very young man, is expected to do. If the process of voting or attending political meetings will degrade women it will degrade the clergymen. If it will soil the purity of

delicate and refined ladies, it will soil the purity of delicate and refined gentlemen. Meanness, coarseness, selfishness, violence and fraud are not of the essence of government. If the fastidious and refined scholar or man of wealth will not leave his palace in Fifth Avenue to go to the polling places in the city of New York, the government of that city will perhaps be abandoned to the base and criminal classes. But give his wife and daughter the right to go, and he will go with them, and he will see to it that the process of voting is conducted under conditions and with surroundings which will make it decent and clean, and fit for the participation of every refined person of either sex.

Shall women leave the cradle, or the parlor, or the kitchen, to plunge into politics? No. Shall our farmers leave the farm, or our scholars the study, or our workmen the factory, or our sailors the ship, to plunge into politics? No.

Women can contribute their share to and exercise their right in the government of the State with not more sacrifice of the other duties of life than is made by their husbands or brothers. There are some public duties which require the devolution of a large part of the working hours of life, and in some cases the entire life of the citizen to which they are assigned. As many of these duties can be performed by the women as the men, and the public duties which can be performed by women as well as by men, are as important to the well-being of the State. There are many duties for which most women are unfitted. There are many duties for which most men are unfitted, and there are some which—as I hope it may come in the course of time to be seen—are unfit for any human being, man or woman, to perform, and which in the better time that we look for will cease to be considered duties at all.

The same arguments with which we have to deal have been used against every extension of suffrage. Good and wise men dreaded to admit the large mass of ignorant and poor, men easily excited by passion, to the great and sacred work of ruling the State. But history and experience have shown us that on the whole that State is best ruled where the largest number of citizens have a share in the government.

WHY WOMEN SHOULD VOTE

JANE ADDAMS.

(*Ladies' Home Journal*: 27:21-2. January, 1910.)

If woman would fulfill her traditional responsibility to her own children; if she would educate and protect from danger, factory

children who must find their recreation on the street; if she would bring the cultural forces to bear upon our materialistic civilization; and if she would do it all with the dignity and directness fitting one who carries on her immemorial duties, then she must bring herself to the use of the ballot—that latest implement of self-government. May we not fairly say that American women need this implement in order to preserve the home?

LAST PROTEST AGAINST WOMAN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT

JAMES L. HUGHES

(Arena: 10:2101-13. July, 1894.)

Duty is the broad ground on which the question rests. Thousands of pure, home-loving women sincerely believe it to be their duty to vote, in order to help decide great social and national questions that affect the well-being of their country and their homes. They surely have as well defined a right to vote as those have to oppose woman's enfranchisement. This is an age of individual liberty. Right and duty and conscience should guide us. Even majorities should never tyrannize over minorities in such a way as to prevent the honest expressions of opinion in the most effectual way—by marking a ballot.

Women demand no special laws. She asks her place as a citizen, and wishes only to stand, a free woman, side by side with her brother man to aid in working out the highest destiny of humanity. Where her influence would be evil instead of good she has no desire to go. More than this, she is willing to trust enlightened and liberal men to decide in regard to the justness and wisdom of her claims to the right to a higher and broader sphere of duty.

Woman is governed by law as man is; woman may own property and pay taxes as man does; woman is interested in the home and in the State as fully as man is; woman is as much interested in her children as man is; woman is a responsible individual, quite as much as man is. It is unjust to say that every abstract claim of right that can be established in favor of man's voting does not belong equally to woman.

EXTRACT FROM AN ADDRESS BY MISS M. CAREY THOMAS

President of Bryn Mawr College

(Delivered before the Twenty-eighth Annual Convention of the
National American Woman Suffrage Association,
held in Baltimore, February 8, 1906.)

In the year 1903 there were in the United States, according to the report of the Commissioner of Education, 5,749 women studying in women's colleges and 24,863 women studying in co-educational colleges. If the annual rate of increase has continued the same, as it undoubtedly has during the past three years, there are in college at the present time 38,268 women students of true college grade. Although there are in the United States about 1,800,000 less women than men, women already constitute considerably over one-third of the entire student body, and are steadily gaining on men. This means that in another generation or two one-half of all the people who have been to college in the United States will be women, and just as surely as the seasons of the year succeed one another, or the law of gravitation works, just so surely will this great body of educated women wish to use their trained intelligence in making the towns, cities and the States of their native country better places for themselves and their children to live in; just so surely will the men, with whom they have worked side by side in college classes, claim and receive their aid in political as well as in home life. The logic of events does not lie. It is unthinkable that women who have learned to act for themselves in college and have become awakened there to civic duties, should not care for the ballot to enforce their wishes. The same is true of women in every woman's club, and of every individual woman who tries to obtain laws to save little children from working cruel hours in cotton mills, or to open summer gardens for homeless little waifs on the streets of a great city. These women, too, are being irresistibly driven to desire equal suffrage for the sake of the wrongs they try to right. The women's clubs of Chicago united only the other day to send delegates to ask the legislature to give women municipal suffrage in the new Chicago charter.

In the early seventies my mother was profoundly stirred by the terrible fate of poor girls in Baltimore, arrested perhaps on false charges, confined over night in police stations, and subjected to the brutalities of policemen and men prisoners. She begged in vain through many months for women matrons. One day when she was being driven fruitlessly from one politician to another she had to stop at a polling booth to let her ignorant negro coachman, who

could neither read nor write, vote for these very men whom she had implored in vain. She has often told me that from that moment of bitter humiliation in which she, a woman, who could *not* vote, held the reins for the ignorant man who *could*, she never again doubted that women must vote in order to protect the interests of other women. Sooner or later every sensitive woman finds herself face to face with conditions like these which degrade her womanhood. For it is in truth as degrading, though perhaps less grotesque, for an ignorant white coachman to decide by his vote how his mistress shall be taxed, or how much, or how little, she and her children shall be protected from disease and crime.

In all matters of social welfare we must argue not so much from abstract right and justice as from observed facts. It seems very clear that on the whole universal manhood suffrage, unsatisfactory as it is, works the least injustice to the enfranchised multitudes of men, and that the trend of modern civilization is setting itself irresistibly in this direction. Experience also proves that women as well as men need the ballot to protect them in their special interests and in their power to gain a livelihood. Our new reform school board of Philadelphia contains not one woman among its twenty-five members to represent the interests of women. No women teachers receive the same salaries as men teachers, for the same work, and no women, however successful, are appointed to the best paid and most influential school positions. Yet more than one-half of the children in the schools of Philadelphia are women; and it is the mothers, and not the fathers, who care most profoundly for the education of the children of Philadelphia. What is true of Philadelphia is true in the main of the public schools in every town and city of forty-one states of the United States. But it is not true in the four equal suffrage States of the United States, or in any part of the great equal suffrage Australian commonwealth.

I confidently believe that equal suffrage is coming far more swiftly than most of us suspect. Educated, public-spirited women will soon refuse to be subjected to such humiliating conditions. Educated, public-spirited men will recoil in their turn before the sheer unreason of the position that the opinions and wishes of their wives and mothers are to be consulted upon every other question except the laws and government under which they and their husbands and children must live and die.

WOMAN THE SAVIOR OF THE STATE

SELMA LAGERLÖF

Abstract of an Address delivered before the Sixth Congress of the
International Woman Suffrage Alliance in Stockholm.
(World's Work for February, 1912.)

Up to the present time in the world's history the work of woman has been that of making the home. Man's work during that time has been the creation of the state. While the home is woman's creation primarily, she alone has not created it. Fortunately for her and for all of us she has ever had the man with her. Had the woman toiled alone she would not have solved the problem. The home would not be in existence either as a dream or a reality.

But in the creating of the state man has stood alone. Nothing has impelled him to take woman with him into the hall of justice, into the civil service department, into the house of commerce. He has forged his way alone. But has he succeeded? Witness the hatred between the classes; witness the stifled cries from beneath, all the threats and revolutions. Witness the complaints of the unemployed; witness emigration. Does all this signify that he has succeeded or that he ever can succeed alone? It is here that the great Woman Invasion into man's field of labor and into the territory of the state begins. Where is the State in which there are no unprotected children? Where is the State that punishes offenders only with the idea of correction and development? Where is the State that utilizes every talent in which the unfortunate receives as much thoughtful consideration as do the most favored? Where is the State wherein none of its members may go to waste in idleness, drunkenness, and in shameless living?

We women are not perfect beings. You men are not more perfect than we are. How are we to attain that which is great and good unless we uphold each other? We think that the time has now arrived when the highest development and perfection of the State demands the active participation of both man and woman. We do not think that the work can be accomplished at once, but we do believe that it would be folly to reject our help. We believe that the winds of God are bearing us onward; that our little masterwork, the home, was our creation with the help of man. The great masterwork, the State, shall be perfected by man when in all seriousness he takes woman as his helper.

A SYMPOSIUM—WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE

(Extracts from *The Chautauquan*, April, 1891. Vol XIII.)

BY LUCY STOWE:

A movement for woman suffrage is part of the world-wide movement for equal human rights. This began by asking for woman better work, better wages, higher education, kinder laws, and a voice in deciding what the laws should be. During the forty years and more since these claims began to be made, almost everything asked for has been secured, except the right to vote.

The plea for the last remaining advance step—the right to vote—rests upon the clearest grounds of equity and good sense. It is fair and right that those who obey the laws should have a voice in making them. It is fair and right that those who pay taxes should have a voice as to the amount of tax and the way in which it should be spent. The objections brought against it are only the same old ones which have been urged against each successive step in the woman's movement this far—that women would be unsexed, that it would break up the family, that the majority of women do not want it, etc. Those of us who have heard these arguments brought forward in turn against the opening of more occupations to women, against the higher education, against the admission of women to the professions, and against each successive change in the property laws for the last forty years, cannot be expected to pay much respect to them now.

BY FRANCIS E. WILLARD:

Our danger in the republic is not from a general but a class ballot.

If all were obliged to vote—as they will be some day, let us hope—good would overbalance evil, but when slums vote and schools do not, a danger signal is flung out which wise men can but heed. Women are a conservative force, and in the nature of the case must always be. It is for their interest that General Grant's motto, "Let us have peace," be incorporated into the public policy. Arbitration instead of war between nations, and instead of strikes and lockouts between corporations, would be the outcome of their inherited tendencies, observation, and experience. Women are for home protection every time; and the chief cornerstone of the State is the hearthstone. They are, in the nature of the case, opposed to the saloon, the gambling-den, the haunt of infamy. When women were safe only because entrenched in castles, and men rode forth to the deadly hand to hand encounters that war then involved, it is no wonder that the idea of a ballot in their small white hands occurred to nobody. But in a peaceful and industrial nation that idea has come because women can help, by hav-

ing a vote, as much as she is helped. Her self-registered opinion upon questions conclusive of the common good, will strengthen, ennoble, and dignify public opinion as expressed with authority at the ballot box. It was so on the text-book question in Boston; it is so in Kansas where municipal suffrage has been the largest factor in the enforcement of prohibition law. It is but a remnant of the old-time battle thunder; the fast fleeing echo of those olden days of force now hasting to be gone, that unconsciously to themselves, reappears in the voices of men good and gifted, who declaim on the negative side of this argument for the emancipation of women.

WHERE THE WOMEN VOTE

PAUL KENNADAY.

It does not appear that the polling and electioneering in the times when men only voted were any different in tone from the orderly sober family affair they are now. Women go to the polls alone, or with their husbands, fathers, or brothers, and vote without annoyance or intimidation according as their consciences dictate or their whims decide, quite as do their menfolk.

But, on the whole, the opinion of New Zealand men and women themselves is that women, since they have had the franchise, have had a clear and direct influence on very few political measures aside from the single one of temperance reform.

The fears that women would be dominated by priestly influences have proved entirely groundless in New Zealand. There is absolutely no evidence that such is the fact. In New South Wales and Queensland a certain division along sectional lines was noticed, but nothing which was evidence of interference by the church. Roman Catholics in certain districts of Sydney, for instance, will return no candidates but Roman Catholics, and state aid for parochial schools is a part of their platform, but they are none the less independent voters and free of undue influence from their spiritual advisers.

In 1893, the first year when women voted at a general election, 78 per cent of the adult female population registered as electors, and of these over 85 per cent voted. By 1905 the proportion of registered electors had gradually increased to 212,876 women, or to nearly 94 per cent of the adult women of the Dominion. Of these 175,046, or 82 per cent, voted. The figures for the men are almost identical—96½ per cent registered, and of these 84 per cent voted.

AN EQUAL SUFFRAGE STATE IN EARNEST

(An Editorial in *World's Work*, for February, 1912.)

The men of California gave woman the suffrage and now find that they have enfranchised nearly a hundred thousand more voters than they can themselves muster. The subject has its jocular aspect. Suppose, for example, some issue should arise whereon there would be a division of opinion by sex!

Both the jocular and serious aspects are emphasized by the political zeal of the women. Every woman's club in California has turned to the study of American history and of the problems of the day. Even the women who opposed suffrage, or were indifferent to it, take their new status with a sober sense of its responsibilities. They are diligently studying the proper use of the ballot. It may be that the men did better than they guessed.

FAIR PLAY FOR WOMEN

GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS

The woman's rights movement is the simple claim that the same opportunity and liberty which a man has in civilized society shall be extended to the woman who stands at his side—equal or unequal in special powers, but an equal member of society. She must prove her power as he proves his. When Rosa Bonheur paints a vigorous and admirable picture of Normandy horses, she proves that she has a hundred-fold more right to do it than scores of butchers and bunglers in color who wear coats and trousers, and whose right, therefore, nobody questions. When the Misses Blackwell or Miss Zachyewska or Miss Hunt or Miss Preston or Miss Avery, accomplishing themselves in medicine, with a firm hand and a clear brain, carry the balm of life to suffering men, women and children, it is as much their right to do it—as much their sphere—as it is that of any long-haired, sallow, dissipated boy in spectacles who hisses them as they go upon their holy mission.

And so when Joan of Arc follows God and leads the army; when the Maid of Saragosa loads and fires the cannon; when Mrs. Stowe makes her pen the heaven-appealing tongue of an outraged race; when Grace Darling and Ida Lewis, pulling their boats through the pitiless waves, save fellow creatures from drowning; when Mrs. Patten, the captain's wife at sea—her husband lying helplessly ill in his cabin—puts everybody aside and herself steers the ship to port, do you ask me whether these are not exceptional women? I am a man and you are a woman, but Florence Nightingale, demanding supplies for sick

soldiers in the Crimea, and when they were delayed by red-tape, ordering a file of soldiers to break down the doors and bring them—which they do, for the brave love bravery—seems to me quite as womanly as the loveliest girl in the land, dancing at the gayest ball in a dress of which the embroidery is the pinched lines of starvation in another girl's face, and whose pearls are the tears of despair in her eyes. Jenny Lind enchanting the heart of a nation; Anna Dickinson pleading for the equal liberty of her sex; Lucretia Mott publicly bearing testimony against the sin of slavery, are doing what God, by his great gifts of eloquence and song, appointed them to do. And whatever generous and noble duty, either in a private or a public sphere, God gives any woman the will and the power to do, that, and that only, for her, is feminine.

But have women, then, no sphere as women? Undoubtedly they have, as men have a sphere as men. If a woman is a mother, God gives her certain affections, and cares springing from them, which we may be very sure she will not forget, and to which, just in the degree that she is a true woman, she will be fondly faithful. We need not think that it will be necessary to fence her in, nor to suppose that she would try to evade these duties and responsibilities if perfect liberty were given her. As Syndey Smith said of education, we need not fear that, if girls study Greek and mathematics, mothers will desert their infants for quadratic equations.

But the sphere of the family is not the sole sphere of either men or women. They are not only parents, they are human beings, with genius, talents, aspirations, ambition. They are also members of the State, and from the very equality of the parental function which perpetuates the State, they are equally interested in its welfare. Has the mother less concern than the father in the laws that regulate the great social temptations which everywhere yawn for their children, or in the general policy of the government which they are summoned to support? Is she less entitled to the fruits of her industry than he, and if it be the best that some arrangement be made by law for the common support of the family, is there any just reason why she should not be consulted in making the law as well as he? The woman earns property and owns it. Society taxes her, and tries her, and sends her to the jail or the gallows. Can it be improper that she be tried by her peers, or inexpedient that she have a voice in making the law that taxes her?

It is said that she influences the man now. Very well; do you object to that? And if not, is there any reason why she should not do directly what she does indirectly? If it is proper that her opinion should influence a man's vote, is there any good reason why it should

not be independently expressed? Or is it said that she is represented by men? Excuse me; I belong to a country which said with James Otis in the forum and with George Washington in the field that there is no such thing as virtual representation. The guarantee of equal opportunity in modern society is the ballot. It may be a clumsy contrivance, but it is the best we have yet found. In our system a man without a vote is but half a man. When we gave the freedmen their civil rights, we gave them a gun; when we added political equality, we loaded it and made it effective. So long as women are forbidden political equality, the laws and feelings of society will be unjust to them.

The very moment women passed out of the degradation of the Greek household and the contempt of the Roman law, they began their long and slow ascent, through prejudice, sophistry and passion to their perfect equality of choice and opportunity as human beings; and the assertion that when a majority of women ask for equal political rights they will be granted, is a confession that there is no conclusive reason against their sharing them. And if that be so, how can their admission rightfully depend upon the majority? Why should the woman who does not care to vote prevent the voting of her neighbor who does? Why should a hundred girls who are content to be dolls and do what Mrs. Grundy expects, prejudice the choice of a single one who wishes to be a woman and do what her conscience requires? You tell me that the great mass of women are uninterested, indifferent, and, upon the whole, hostile to the movement. You say what, of course, you cannot know, but even if it were so, what then? There are some of the noblest and best of women both in this country and in England who are not indifferent. They are the women who have thought for themselves upon the subject. The others, the great multitude, are mainly those who have not thought at all, who have acquiesced in the old order, and who have accepted the prejudices of men. Shall their unthinking acquiescence or the intelligent wish of their thoughtful sisters decide the question?

WOMAN AND THE HOME

A. CASWELL ELLIS

They tell us that the first duty of woman is as mother and the highest sphere of woman is the home. True, and that it is which places upon woman the obligation to enter into the life of her community and nation and help to make them a fit home for her child and her family. Before her child begins to take food her mother's duty commands her to see that there is an efficient dairy and food inspec-

tion in her city, state and nation, that her child be not poisoned by impure food; before dread disease shall have slipped into her home and struck down her child, her mother's duty commands her to do her share in awakening the public to the need of better sanitary laws and of their rigid enforcement; before her child goes into the streets, as he must soon go, her mother's duty commands her to see to it that these streets are safe, to see to it that her child be not corrupted there by degrading shows, immoral pictures, or dens for human dissipation and debauchery; when her child goes to the school, then the school becomes a part of her home, and her mother's duty commands her to see that conditions are provided in that school that will strengthen and develop in a sane way the mind and body of her little one; when the laws are being made under which her child must live, and by means of which the opportunities to develop the God-given possibilities of his nature are to be provided, or the door of opportunity is to be shut in his face, then her home becomes the nation and her mother's duty commands that she enter the struggle against the combined forces of the professional politician and commercial corruptionist, to see that the laws under which her innocent child must live shall not allow his tender body to be ground up in the mills of greedy commerce nor his pure soul blighted by the withering breath of political and social corruption.

Sooner or later it must be recognized that the duties of a true mother to her child and her home are not confined to the kitchen and back yard, nor can she evade her responsibility as a citizen by turning it over to her husband, any more than the husband can successfully turn over the family morals and religion to his wife.

The fact that so many people seem to think that a woman can go to school, go to the theater, trade and work in the stores, attend banquets and public discussions, go to church, serve on important boards, read the papers and persuade her husband to vote right without harming herself, but that the minute she puts a ticket in a ballot box she will unsex herself, is simply an evidence of the power of a savage tradition and an indication of the lack of a sense of humor on the part of otherwise thoughtful men and women.

SELECTED ARGUMENTS OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

EX-JUSTICE BROWN

Late of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Whoever seeks to effect a radical change in legislation of long standing assumes the burden of showing that the existing law is iniquitous or unjust, and that the proposed change is reasonably calculated to remedy its defects. The very fact that certain fundamental principles have prevailed under all forms of government, from a time whence no historical tradition runs to the contrary, is strong evidence of their wisdom, and suggests a continuance of the policy expressed in the homely maxim of letting well enough alone. Experimental legislation is always unsafe, and frequently produces an effect directly contrary to that intended; or, if successful in suppressing the evils sought to be remedied, raises up others, totally unsuspected before, to take their place. Such statutes are, unfortunately, too common in this country, where the legislatures are besought to remedy every fancied evil, from the right to vote to the length of ladies' hat pins, or of sheets upon hotel beds.

From time immemorial the power to govern has been devolved upon the male population. In the few instances in which, under a local law of succession, the crown has been worn by a woman, the governing power has usually rested with her male advisers, and the physical power always with her army and navy. While this power of governing has often, in obedience to long-established customs, been exercised oppressively, and has occasionally reduced women to a position little above that of slaves, I am not aware of any such complaint against legislation in this country; and, after all, the question of woman suffrage must be determined by the state of things existing in the country to which it is proposed to apply it.

The laws of nearly, if not all, of the states of this Union are even *more favorable to women* than to men. They have full control of their own property, and may sell, convey or bequeath it to whomsoever they please; while in the conveyance of his own real estate, the husband must usually obtain the consent of his wife. Women are entitled to their own earnings, and may dispose of them as they please, while the husband is bound to make use of his for the support of his wife and family. He is liable for the ante-nuptial debts of his wife, while no such obligation rests upon her for her husband's debts.

Women are freely admitted to all trades, employment and professions to which they are physically adapted. They are rapidly obtaining a monopoly of stenography, typewriting, telegraphy, telephony, and are competing successfully with men as saleswomen in the principal mercantile establishments, and as operatives in factories. The best schools and colleges are open to such of them as desire a higher education. The only tangible complaint made against our laws at present seems to consist in the fact that *women are taxed without being represented* in the Legislature. This grievance, however, is more fancied than real,—a popular political war-cry, but to be applied with some regard for the actual facts. It is doubtless a safe proposition to assert that property owners should not be taxed without being represented. But this should be taken in connection with another principle,—that no system of taxation or of suffrage was ever devised that did not create individual instances of injustice. For example, in the matter of age, some line must be drawn between the voting and non-voting population. In America this has been uniformly fixed at the age of twenty-one, and yet we all of us know of young men of twenty or less who are far better qualified to vote, by intelligence and the possession of property, than the great mass of those of twenty-one and upwards. But the line must be drawn, and arbitrarily drawn, somewhere, and the fact that certain boys may own millions in their own right has never been supposed to entitle them to vote, or that the denial of this right involved a violation of the principles of taxation without representation. A foreigner may possess a large fortune, and have been educated at a foreign university, but he can never vote until he has qualified by residence in this country for a certain time. The same remark may be made of the line drawn in the Southern States between the white and colored population,—though no one would have the hardihood to deny that many colored men are superior in intelligence to some of their white brethren.

Now, the number of women possessing taxable property of their own is very small, probably not exceeding one in twenty of the total number. The residue who have inherited taxable property from their husbands or relatives, are so few in number as to be a negligible quantity, in dividing the voting from the non-voting population. The fact that injustice may be done to one by denying her a vote is a poor excuse for forcing the right to vote upon the nineteen others, if they do not wish it. Legislation is or ought to be based upon the good of the whole, and not upon the desires of particular individuals. It is presumed to speak for the great mass of the people, and not for the exceptions.

What, then, are the chief *objections to woman suffrage*? In this connection I wish to admit the perfect equality of the sexes in the gen-

eral scheme of creation. I claim no superiority for man; I admit none for women. But, while conceding the equality of the two sexes, there are undeniable *differences* which it would be folly to ignore. There are certain particulars in which the superiority of one sex over the other is plainly manifested. To man must be accorded pre-eminence:

1. In physical strength. This is undeniable, and requires that the heavy labor of the world must be done by him.
2. The preservation of public order and safety.
3. The inauguration and management of great undertakings.
4. The dispassionate view of important questions, which we call the judicial temperament.

Does not the superiority of the male sex in these particulars contain a suggestion that they also should determine as to when great enterprises should be undertaken, and how they should be carried out? If the labor and expense incidental to the building and operation of railways and manufacturing establishments, or the construction of buildings and the improvements of streets and roads be furnished by men, is it not reasonable to say that men should also determine when and how these projects should be made effective? If the policing of cities and the preservation of the peace is to be secured by men, should they not also judge of the necessity for particular measures? If wars are contemplated, should not the necessity for such wars be passed upon by men who are to provide the material, to constitute the armies and to fight its battles? Would it not be absurd, if the men of the country were opposed to a particular war, that the country should be driven into it by the votes of women?

On the other hand, there are doubtless other spheres of activity in which the superiority of women is as marked as that of men in the particulars already named. They are:

1. The management of the household and the direction of family life.
2. The rearing and education of young children.
3. The nursing of the sick, from which of late men have been completely displaced by women.
4. Their superior vitality and patient endurance of suffering.
5. Their superior natural refinement and delicacy.
6. Their intuitive perceptions, which are more accurate than those of men.

This enumeration also contains a suggestion that, in all such legislation as relates to the education of children, the establishment of public schools, the selection of teachers and of studies, women should have at least an equal voice with men. The right of women to vote upon school questions has been conferred, and I think wisely so, in

nearly twenty different states; but the small extent to which that right has been exercised by the women does not augur well for its success. In a paper in advocacy of woman suffrage by the late and greatly lamented Mr. Justice Brewer, he states that while there are about 700,000 women authorized to vote in Massachusetts on school questions, the number actually voting fell from 18,000 in 1906 to 13,000 in 1907. In 189 towns, where 3,600 women were registered, not a single woman voted. In Cleveland, Ohio, the number of registered voters diminished from 6,681 in 1904 to 3,179 in 1907. If this be regarded as a fair experiment, it must be conceded a failure.

Indeed, one of the chief obstacles to the introduction of female suffrage is the *apparent indifference of the women* themselves. If there were a general sentiment among them that their rights were not being properly respected, and that their votes were really needed to protect them, I feel confident that the natural chivalry of men would rally to their support, and, irrespective of every other consideration, would cheerfully concede them the ballot. I do not, however, find among them any general demand for it. Earnest advocates, eloquent platform speakers there are undoubtedly, but in private conversation, particularly with women of the upper classes, most are actually opposed, or at best indifferent, to a change. Although the rights of women in England are not protected as they are in this country, I do not regard the riotous mobs which besiege Parliament, assault members, destroy property and court martyrdom as representative women of Great Britain. It would certainly be little to the credit of Parliament to permit itself to be hectored into the grant of suffrage by such means. A resort to similar violence would be simply impossible in any American capital.

Fashion is so much more potent a fact in the lives of women than in those of men that there could be no general participation of women of the upper classes in exercising the right of suffrage, unless it were made fashionable to do so. Once make it as fashionable to go to the polls as to a matinee or a musicale, and every woman would vote, if only for the purpose of being seen. But let it be once understood that voting was unwomanly and fit only for the stronger sex and what we may term masculine femininity, the suffrage would fall at once into the hands of the lower class and a few enthusiasts of the better sort. Considerations of fashion are rarely applied to questions of duty, but rather to those of fancy or pleasure. Indeed, considerations of duty outside of the church or domestic circles are of feebleness of efficacy than is generally supposed. Having found ample scope for the exercise of their peculiar functions in the family circle, women are generally content to leave the more serious questions of

bread-winning and of government to the male sex. Every argument upon the subject finally comes back to the question whether nature has not answered it as effectively as certain economical questions are answered by the law of supply and demand. While women are constantly winning their way to work formerly considered the exclusive prerogative of men, and have not been permitted but encouraged to do so, there is after all a reserve of work which must be done by men, and in which it would be absurd for women to participate as it would be for men to undertake the management of a family or the care of young children. A man who busies himself with such matters is looked upon with derision, while the woman who aspires to the platform or pulpit, and desires at least to be seen in every public assemblage, is regarded as asserting merely an inherent right. With certain limitations this is just and proper, but in the end considerations of sex are sure to assert themselves as the dominating influence. Hence, the conservative American matron and her daughters, brought up to care for the family and children, according to historical ideas which have held sway since the earliest days of the distaff and the loom, are content that in matters of state men shall bear the burden. Nor do the peculiar prerogatives of women involve any question of inferiority. Of two boys, one of whom is fond of mathematics and the other of the classics, there is no question of superiority of one over the other, but simply of difference. The mathematician might be expected to make the better astronomer, engineer or contractor; the other, the better scholar or professional man—but both may be equally eminent in their own callings. So the particulars in which each sex is superior to the other are equally essential to the perpetuation of the race, and to the maintenance of the family, which is the basis of the whole social system.

I consider that there is a positive danger involved in any extension of the suffrage to large classes who have not heretofore enjoyed it. True, this is a government of the people, but not necessarily of all persons constituting the people. The word "people" is used simply to distinguish it from a despotism or oligarchy; but the power of actually governing has always rested with an exceedingly small number of men, the great body of the people being merely represented by them. It is a grave question who are entitled to be thus represented. Surely not children or persons of defective intelligence. Formerly it was only extended to property owners of greater or less amount; then to those able to read and write—finally to everybody, or what is called manhood suffrage.

The results have not been altogether encouraging. While universal suffrage has been fairly successful in the country and in the small

towns, in large cities the consequences have been such as to justify fully the apprehension of its opponents. Indeed, it has been so near an absolute failure that the most important political question now confronting us is how to get rid of it without sacrificing the principle of self government. In the District of Columbia Congress exercises directly the "exclusive legislation" vested in it by the Constitution, with the result that Washington is the best governed large city in the country. Other cities have sought relief from conditions which have become intolerable by commissions appointed or elected with apparently satisfactory results. The object in every case is to rid the city of the incubus of a popular and largely an alien vote. The inauguration of this system is really due to Texas. When Galveston was overwhelmed by the sea and nearly swept out of existence it was felt that its upbuilding must not be entrusted to the ordinary municipal politician, but it was put into the hands of a commission of its best citizens, who would do their work solely in the interests of the public. The example of Galveston has been followed by a number of cities in the West, to the great improvement of their municipal governments.

That experimental extensions of the suffrage are often unwise is also shown by the fate of the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution, forbidding discrimination on account of color or race. While in the North, where the colored vote is small, no great harm has resulted, the amendment has been generally disregarded in the South, and a serious attempt to enforce it by the military arm, if persisted in, would probably have resulted in another civil war. This is meant not to express an opinion of the fifteenth amendment, but to show the danger of radical legislation, except to remedy a certain and radical evil.

It is now proposed to extend the right not simply to those who have been unjustly excluded from it, but practically to double the voting population by including a class which has never exercised the franchise, and of whose qualifications we have no practical knowledge. I look upon the experiment as not without peril. While in the ordinary process of peaceful government no danger may be apprehended, I should fear that in critical moments the generous impulses of women might lead them far astray from the path of safety. Women are far more intense in their convictions than men, and, once an opinion is formed, are prone to overlook the obstacles in the way, the difficulties in bringing about the desired results, or even to give credit to the conscientious convictions of others. As the average man who is defeated in a lawsuit is apt to attribute the outcome either to the bribery of judge or jury, rather than to the inher-

ent weakness of his case, a woman who is opposed in a favorite scheme or ambition is loth to admit conscientious motives in those who oppose her. Indeed, it is a common infirmity of both men and women to have the strongest opinions concerning matters of which we really know the least, and which are the least susceptible of proof. A painful instance of this kind occurred in connection with the anti-canteen law, enacted by Congress a few years ago. Those who were in Washington at the time could not fail to appreciate the fact that the passage of the bill was procured by the efforts of crowds of perfectly respectable, upright and conscientious women, who thronged the halls of the Capitol during the debate, practically overawed the members and compelled many of them to vote against their convictions rather than be charged with opposition to the cause of temperance. The consequences are said to be deplorable. Saloons of the lowest class sprang up around the reservations, and if we are to believe the almost universal testimony of army officers, drunkenness increased, arrests increased, desertions increased, though the principle that the United States should no longer be privy to the sale of liquor was fully established.

It would be interesting to inquire what have been the *practical results* of woman suffrage in the States where the experiment has been fairly tried. But, unfortunately, there is an almost total absence of data from which an intelligent opinion can be formed. It would conduce much to our enlightenment if some legislature interested in the subject (and what legislature is not?) should appoint a committee of leading citizens to visit the States in which the experiment has been tried, and by correspondence with foreign countries to investigate the whole subject, to ascertain what proportion of the female population entitled to vote has actually availed itself of the privilege, and to what class it belonged; what reforms in the moral character of the people the women have brought about, or have rendered efficient aid in bringing about; whether they have improved the character of the slums; suppressed gambling; eradicated houses of ill fame; put a stop to graft and corruption in municipal life; provided employment for the poor and educational facilities for their children—in short, given a new and healthful impulse to civic life. If the report of this committee showed a marked improvement in these particulars, attributable to the influence of women, I, for one, would enroll myself under their banner. On the contrary, if it were shown, in a trial which must have lasted from twenty to forty years, to have been ineffective, or a mere excuse for obtaining a share of the spoils or a political prominence, I should say that a good cause for a change had not been proven.

IS WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE AN ENLIGHTENED AND JUSTIFIABLE POLICY FOR THE STATE?

HENRY A. STIMSON

(Bibliotheca Sacra. 67:335-46. April, 1910.)

The argument against woman's suffrage may be summed up in two phrases: it will not do what is claimed for it; and it will occasion unanticipated evil.

WHAT WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE WILL NOT DO

1. It will not remove economic ills. Many are urging it because of the assumed value in bettering the condition of women workers, particularly girls who are on a strike or are abused by the police, and teachers and others who do not receive the same pay as men holding similar positions. No one has, as yet, proposed a program by which, when the ballot is given to women, they can proceed effectively to secure this result. The pay of any worker in any industry is primarily determined by what the industry can afford, and by the available supply of labor. The chief fact in the employment of women is that, with most women, work outside the home is only an *ad interim* employment. It is taken up by women in anticipation of the day when they will marry and abandon it for the life that opens for them in their own home; it is held by other women because the exigencies of their life leave them without a home, or with a home where there is not adequate support. In the latter case they are handicapped in so many directions that their work is necessarily done under serious restrictions.

No one has, as yet, ventured to point out exactly how giving the women the ballot will affect wages. What will affect wages is industrial conditions which give a community exceptional advantage in the open market, cheap raw material, cheap mechanical power, attractive conditions of light and air and cleanliness, abundance of labor of an intelligent class. These and similar things are essential to successful production; and wherever these maintain, wages will be found to be in harmony with them, that is, they will be higher than under other conditions; and they can be maintained because the economic situation of the mills makes it possible to pay them. All that the State can do is to secure as far as possible proper conditions of labor, and to prevent that injury to the community which occurs from child labor and the employment of women in what are to them destructive vocations to which either their necessities or the attractions of large wages might draw them, as, for example, mining.

2. It will not secure better personal treatment for women. Despite the emphasis with which some women speakers repudiate the thought of privilege, the fact is that society rests on the possession of privilege as one of its corner-stones. The characteristic of civilized society is that every member, rich or poor, by virtue of his being a part of the social structure, however humble, shares the privileges which pertain to the community as a whole. Those privileges are in part the gift of God, in climate, and material surroundings, and in still larger part the inheritance of the past, in which much blood has been shed and great sacrifice has been made to secure liberties which otherwise would not exist and which many other communities do not possess. These are privileges to which we may be born, or which we may share by adoption. We speak of them as the gifts of God, or of nature, or of inheritance. In any case they are privileges, and in no true sense rights. They become rights only so far as they are maintained by a sacrifice on the part of the sharers of them akin to what by which they were won. In civilized society the range of such privileges is vastly increased. It extends to personal protection, to all that is involved in good manners, and especially in the courtesy that is shown to women and the tenderness of the public toward children. As a matter of fact, courtesy as between men, but pre-eminently as toward women on the part of men, is the mark of such society. That courtesy is found in highly civilized communities only, and takes on its best forms only when those communities are largely governed by the standards of a very high morality and a very spiritual religion. They are quickly lost wherever a community drops its standard of morality, or becomes indifferent to the sanctions of its religion; so that the treatment of women in the streets and in the social intercourse of a community is one of the surest and most quickly accepted standards of both its morals and its culture. This courtesy does not depend upon any particular form of administration of the State.

3. It will not help the community politically. It is urged that introducing women by the ballot into public life will purify politics. At present the effort to purify politics is resisted chiefly by two factors: on the one hand, a mass of ignorant voters; and on the other hand corrupt, but highly skilled, political managers. Giving women the ballot would at once add greatly to the number of ignorant voters and the mass with which every reform movement has to deal would become by so much the more obstructive, making the situation by so much more difficult than it is now; while, on the other hand, the machine politician is so adept at his trade, because it has so long been practiced by him and his kind, because he is so much less scrupulous than women, and because he can give himself wholly to it as a busi-

ness, that good women and intelligent women would find themselves no match for him in the battle of public life, and would be compelled, in spite of themselves, either to adopt his ways and become like him, increasing corruption, or to surrender to his efforts, and consciously or unconsciously become his tool. The educational process for women, to fit them for the ballot, would necessarily be preceded by a long period of political disorganization and corruption which would only repeat the Carpetbag period of the South, and reproduce evils not unlike those which were precipitated upon the country by giving the suffrage to the Freedmen, even though at the time that seemed an absolutely necessity following upon the civil war.

4. Furthermore, it will not help women individually. It is claimed that the suffrage is necessary chiefly for the good that it will do to women. This is so purely an untried experiment that there is room for very grave doubts about it. Undoubtedly, it is well for man or woman to be intelligent in matters of public life, but that that intelligence will be secured to any great degree by the possession of the ballot does not appear; or, at least, it would seem that every opportunity of gaining information, and of intelligent interest in public affairs, is open to women today if she cares to avail herself of them, and the growing intelligence of the community will make this knowledge both attractive and available for her, whether she has the ballot or not.

It is not necessary to deliver women from the "tyranny of men" or the oppression of daily toil. Civilization is rapidly doing that. In barbarism woman does all the arduous labor. As society advances man has assumed that, and the woman has been left free for the care of the home, until today even milking and the making of butter on the farm are no longer woman's work. The vast majority of the women in civilized lands can today live a womanly life. Personal culture and personal comfort and gracious service are within their reach as never before.

But it is also to be said that the possession of the ballot will be very sure to create unanticipated evils.

WHAT WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE WILL DO.

1. It will bring new temptations to weak women, and crowd upon them with great force, in ways which women little anticipate.

2. It will greatly increase the ignorant and usable proletariat. It is not a question whether women are more or less intelligent than men, or whether their character is stronger or weaker. The possession of the ballot would at once add a mass of votees to the voting list who are little informed as to the questions that are before them, are little

accustomed to deal with external pressure, and are correspondingly open to undue influence. This today is the great burden upon the civic life of every democratic community, and democracy is today on trial in no other direction more seriously than in this, its inability promptly and adequately to educate its less intelligent voters and to hold them to any adequate sense of their electoral responsibilities. Increasing the number of such voters would be a disaster.

3. It will introduce new elements of evil into corrupt politics, because women are women and not men. Their entrance into corrupt political life so far as they would enter it, and many would, because women are not all saints, would be the introduction of an unspeakable element of public demoralization, to offset which it would be necessary to show that the benefit of having good women enter politics would far counterbalance this evil, which unfortunately is not demonstrable.

4. It will cost women the loss of much of the personal influence which they now possess. So far as women have influenced legislation and public officers, and their influence has been constant and effective in many directions, it has been due to the character and the intelligence of the women who advocated good causes. Does any one think that the late Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell, of blessed memory, would have had more influence in the State of New York than she did if she had had the ballot?

5. It will add a new excitement to lives already greatly over-excited, especially in the cities. One of the chief problems of our American life today is to protect even the men from pressure of over-strain. We are seeing many of the strongest fall and die in the prime of middle life because the burden of life is too heavy for them. The suffrage will add one more to these destructive influences.

6. It will divert the attention of the women from the agencies for good which are now within their reach.

7. And, finally, it introduces a terrible risk into the life of the State because, once given, it is unalterable. The experiment must be tried, if at all, in its entirety. The women recognize the little value of the attempts that have been made of giving them a limited suffrage. In Massachusetts, where thirty years ago women were permitted to vote in educational matters, it is a complete failure. In one hundred eighty cities and towns of Massachusetts last year not a single woman voted. In France, more recently, women have been permitted to vote for the judges of the commercial courts, and though more women are engaged in business in France than in any other country, and French women are proverbially expert as business women, hardly a woman has voted. And in the cases where small groups did appear to vote they were found to be clerks in banks whose officers sent them out for

the purpose. Therefore, it must be tried, if today we would satisfy its advocates, without limitation. It must be given to women very much as the ballot was given to the liberated slaves of the South. We certainly do not want to find ourselves under the necessity of trying to take it back, because of the evils which it may be found to produce, by methods like those which the Southern States have felt compelled to protect themselves—methods obviously more disastrous to the morals of the State than the evils which they were set to remedy.

It must, therefore, be recognized that while woman's suffrage may be called an experiment, if it be once granted, it ceases that instant to become experimental; but becomes, for better or worse, an unalterable fact in political life, with probable consequences far too serious to make the thought of the experiment even tolerable, not to say prudent.

Thus, for every reason, both positive and negative, the claims of woman's suffrage are unsound, and ought to be resisted.

WRONG AND PERILS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE

J. M. BUCKLEY

(Century: 48:613-23. August, 1894.)

The practical objections to woman suffrage can be most clearly stated as follows:

1. *Universal suffrage exists in the United States with the exception of certain classes.* It is an unreasonable expectation that this policy will be changed. If women are to be admitted to the suffrage, all of sound mind, of legal age, not disfranchised by the effect of crime or other specific causes applying equally to men, will be entitled to vote. This will add the more than three millions of negro women, all women without respect to intelligence, character, or race, except the Chinese and the Indians. In the whole country it will nearly double the vote, and in some States much more than double it. Similar considerations apply to jury duty, which is a concomitant of the ballot. That the nation has gone so far in a dangerous path does not make it necessary to proceed farther.

2. *The physiological and pathological reasons for the abstention of women from political work and excitement are not diminished but increased by the complexity of modern civilization.* Exceptional cases of voluntary endurance of physical and mental strain, exhibited by the triumph of certain women in the contests of scholastic life, or in bearing unusual burdens in business, should not divert attention from the usual facts of personal or domestic life, or from the fact that a

large proportion of the best women in youth, middle life, and age will be unable to respond to demands upon them at set times, in storm or calm, for the different forms of service involved in voting and holding office, or in securing the qualifications for one or the other.

Here and there a physician may evoke smiles and compliments from advocates of the suffrage for women by declaring that he knows of no anatomical or physiological impediment to the assumption by women of political life. But the medical faculty as a whole have no sympathy with his sycophancy, and the common sense of the race, and the observation and experience of most women, concur with them rather than with those who would render legal and necessary the participation of the whole sex in the agitation and exposures of campaigns and elections.

3. *Woman suffrage cannot achieve what its advocates expect.* They think they will reform public morals, close the saloons and other places of evil resort, and realize absolute prudence, honesty, and economy in management.

Laws that do not carry the votes of a majority of the men of a community cannot be executed. Law-abiding citizens require no force to induce obedience; but those disposed to break the law can be compelled to keep it only by force. There is a natural instinct in man which leads him to submit to persuasion by women, and to resist force applied by them. It cannot be eradicated by philosophy, refinement, or religion, and in every generation reappears with undiminished vigor. If women were admitted to political life, the tendency would be for both parties to pass all kinds of laws to please women, which would be dead letters unless they carried the judgment of the majority of the male citizens. In the absence of this, to enforce them would involve a change in the character of the government in the direction of despotism.

4. *Religious feuds would affect political life much more than under present circumstances.* It is of immense importance to the welfare of this country that the separation of church and State be complete. The feelings of women upon the subject of religion are so intense that the franchise, in a large majority of instances, would be exercised under the power of religious prejudices. John Bright, in one of his most important speeches on the subject, exclaimed, "Of one thing there is no doubt: the influence of priest, parson, and minister will be greatly increased if this measure is passed."

5. *Chivalry, with its refining influence over men, must pass away when women become politicians.* It is not a favorable portent that of late it has become customary for the advocates of women suffrage to disparage that chivalrous feeling which causes normal men, wherever

modern civilization exists, to treat women with deference, and to be ready to extend them needful aid. At present one of the chief refining elements of society is the respect felt for women as such by men. Even those who voluntarily form evil associations still esteem the ideal woman. The passing or decline of this sentiment is equally unfavorable to both; for it will accustom men to resist the influence of women.

That it will be undiminished when the fierce conflicts of party politics are involved is an unwarranted hope. All special courtesy to women grows out of the recognition of a kind of influence peculiar to them, and a dependence on their part which must be swept away when they contend on the same plane with men in the political arena. There are many indications that it lessens in proportion as women come forward to compete with men in public life and in business. In the latter case it is one incidental result of a necessity; but it will be the natural consequence of a condition when women appear in politics.

In England, when women first appeared upon the hustings, they were received with the old chivalry, but in recent elections, the contest being fierce, all respect has disappeared. Noted women were treated most disrespectfully in the very heart of London, and people of all parties agree that England has never seen so much participation of women, or such rude treatment of them, as in the last election. In Wales, Mrs. Cornwallis West tried to quell a disturbance among the electors who refused to hear Colonel West speak. She obtained a momentary hearing, but the disorder revived, and she exclaimed with much heat, "I am an Irish woman, but it was not until I came to Wales that I found men capable of refusing to hear a woman who was pleading a cause." She was silenced by yells and hisses, and was finally compelled to retire from the platform.

6. *The introduction of women into political life will increase its bitterness.* That politics creates violent feuds is too evident to be questioned. At present they are modified by the undisturbed relations between the wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters of the combatants. When the struggle has been decided at the polls, these social relations serve to bring about a calm and the resumption of personal harmony.

In this country these liabilities have been illustrated where women have come into anything analogous to political life. The feud that existed for years between two wings of the Woman Suffrage Association in the United States is ancient but still instructive history.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, organized for the promotion of an end in which all were agreed, managed by leaders to whom all were accustomed to defer, would not be expected to have

any serious difficulty. But when a feud arose which ostensibly began because of a divergence of opinion with respect to the relation which the Union should sustain to political parties, it speedily became intense, and a distinguished woman, the leader of the minority, more than intimates concerning the national president, that, in all her great work she has been seeking a background for her personal exploits, and a theater for the exercise of her wonderful powers and accomplishments.

To this, by order of the executive committee, a reply was prepared by a sub-committee of four women of national recognition, which, after making various charges, culminates in a passage unsurpassed in sting of innuendo: "Whatever values she has won as chairman of the Woman's Republican National League, as one of the famous 'spellbinders,' and a wife of a Republican official, she has lost the faith of her old comrades in her sincerity, the chaplet of their admiring love, and the crown of leadership in the grandest body of women known in the world."

The closest approximation to political life on a national scale ever made in this country was the National Board of Lady Managers of the World's Fair. There were women of high character and social influence, most of them accustomed to various forms of public life, selected because of their standing in the States whence they came. A large proportion of them at all times spoke and acted in such a manner as to command universal respect, and their work as a whole secured the approbation of the country.

But the board had honors to confer, awards to make, and patronage to distribute. Discord arose between the secretary and the president, the former being a lawyer and a noted advocate of woman suffrage. This controversy lasted for months, threatening to embroil the country. Jealousy of the president's failure to introduce some of her colleagues to the Duchess de Veragua caused a stormy scene. Later another charged a woman in higher office with instructing the presidents of the various meetings to exclude her from participation in the speaking. Owing to various bitter quarrels among the members, the factional opposition, the president intimated her intention to resign. It must be remembered that the president was a woman of tact and of rare ability as a presiding officer. On one day, after a long altercation accompanied by many personal contradictions, the board stopped business, and the members left the hall in confusion without adjournment. A sectional war broke out, when a lady exclaimed with reference to the nomination of jurors, "New York has eight representatives and North Dakota none. I want to know the reason why.

There is something crooked going on here, and I am going to find it out."

Subsequently several women commissioners appealed to the National Commission against alleged injustice. And later, in open debate, one delegate charged another with being "an arrogant, malicious, injurious and vindictive woman," which caused intense general excitement accompanied by ejaculations and tears. For several days the disturbance was renewed; but peace was finally made, and the account of the controversy was expunged from the records. Such was the effect of these scenes that some of the members of the board reversed their opinion on the desirableness of woman's entering political life.

Further illustrations appeared during the recent canvass in the State of New York for petitions to strike out the word male from the Constitution, when a counter-movement was begun by women. The protestants were characterized by educated ladies in public assemblies as "traitors to their sex," "copper-heads," "betrayers of the cause of women," and such was the intensity of the feelings that these terms and phrases evoked general applause. The women who presumed to resist the innovation were characterized by one of their sisters, in a contribution to an important periodical, as "parasites who have mentally retrograded."

7. *It will place a new and terrible strain upon the family relation.*

8. *To invest her with the responsibility of voting will diminish the real power of woman in speech.*

9. *It may reasonably be expected to deteriorate the moral tone of most of the women who become political leaders, and affect unfavorably all who take an active part in politics; and it will introduce dangerous forms of corruption.*

Should the suffrage be extended to women the grant can never be recalled. Experiments in legislating upon economic questions, even if unwise, need not be permanently harmful, for they may be repealed; but in dealing with the suffrage, or with moral questions, new laws, if bad, are exceedingly dangerous. They will develop a class lowered in tone, or deriving personal, pecuniary, or political advantages from the new environment, who will vehemently declare that the effect of the innovation is beneficial, and resist all efforts to return to the former state.

Should the duty of governing in the State be imposed upon women, all members of society will suffer; children, by diminished care from their mothers; husbands, from the increase of the contentions, and the decline of the attractions of home; young men and maidens, from the diminution or the destruction of the idealism which invests the family with such charms as to make the hope of a home of one's own,

where in the contrasts of the sexes life may be ever a delight, an impulse to economy and virtue—but the greatest sufferer will be woman. Often those who recollect her genuine freedom of speech, “the might of her gentleness,” the almost resistless potency of her look and touch and voice, will long for the former proud dependence of woman on manliness, reciprocated by man’s reverence for womanliness; while “the new generation, to whom such sweet recollections will be unknown, will blindly rave against their fate or despondently sink under it, as women have never done (from similar causes) under the old regime.” Meanwhile the office-holding, intriguing, campaigning, lobbying, mannish woman will celebrate the day of emancipation—which, alas, will be the day of degradation—when, grasping at sovereignty, she lost her empire.

The true woman needs no governing authority conferred upon her by law. In the present situation the highest evidence of respect that man can exhibit toward woman, and the noblest service he can perform for her, are to vote *nay* to the proposition that would take from her the diadem of pearls, the talisman of faith, hope, and love, by which all other requests are won from men, and substitute for it the iron crown of authority.

SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS OF THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE QUESTION

MRS. MARY K. SEDGWICK.

(*Guntton's Magazine*: 20:333-44. April, 1910.)

Our trouble lies in calling women a distinct class, and in regarding the question from the point of view of the individual rather than the whole State or nation. The men and women of a given stratum of society form one class together; for men and women living together, whether in tenements or in palaces, are not antagonistic nor even indifferent to each other’s welfare. It is only in comparing the exceptional woman with the average man, or the educated and public-spirited woman with the ignorant laborer that we get an apparent basis for equal suffrage. The whole agitation is founded upon a misapprehension of the social unit, which is not the individual but the family, of which each part contributes its share to the general good.

Those who argue that woman would purify politics think of women of the higher type, more conscientious than men of less education and lower morals standards. But the vote of this kind of woman does not replace that of the idle, worthless man. If she votes, so does he, and the women of his family. Where is the gain of doubling the vote without improving the quality?

WORKING-WOMEN AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

PRISCILLA LEONARD

(Harper's Bazar: 43:1169-70. November, 1909.)

Why is the working-girl illy paid, forced to work under unhealthful conditions, and exploited generally? There are three main reasons. Every one of them is economic and absolutely unremediable by a vote or twenty votes.

1. There is an oversupply of working-girls in all the poorly paid trades.

2. The working-girl works largely for pin-money, not for a living wage.

3. Her working period is usually temporary.

In a trade in which there is not an oversupply of women applicants and in which their work is equal to that of men, they command the same wages. Take novel-writing, for example. Mrs. Humphry Ward's prices are the top of the trade. Take Melba and Patti—they cannot complain of low wages. Rosa Bonheur and Cecelia Beaux suffer no injustice in competing with men. Hetty Green can get as much out of the money market as any broker. Even in the teaching profession, the agitation of the woman teachers of New York State to have their wages equalized with those of men by act of the legislature would seem absurd to the Californians, for the California women teachers receive the same wages as the men without any laws on the subject whatever, because there are never more than enough of them to supply the demand. In Colorado, by the way, an equal-suffrage State, the women teachers, at last accounts, do not receive as much as the men teachers—showing that economics do not depend on politics there any more than in other places. But an overcrowded trade is always illy paid—that is economic law. And the working-girls who suffer most, and whom all women want to help, are invariably in the overcrowded trades.

The result of oversupply is that the employer can fix his own prices. If three girls are all trying for the same job (and more than likely there are thirty than three after it) wages can be lowered and yet lowered and there will still be girls enough left to fill the factory or the store or the laundry. With men this situation has been realized long ago—and the powerlessness of a vote to affect it—and men have, therefore, organized their labor. When men's wages go too low or their hours are too long they strike and gain their point—if they gain at all—by cutting off the supply of labor. That is an economic move—and therefore affects things. But politics do not

control economics—if they did every laboring man who is a voter would be getting two dollars a day at least and no days laid off.

WHY I DO NOT BELIEVE IN WOMAN SUFFRAGE

MRS. HUMPHRY WARD

(Ladies' Home Journal, 25:15. November, 1908.)

There is, and always will be, a natural division between the spheres of men and women; an axiom we may deny as we will, and which has a way in the end of "proving" itself "upon our pulses." Is there any reasonableness in denying that men have built up the modern political state, and that men must maintain it? The modern state, as we know, depends ultimately on force. This is constantly disputed by the idealists of the world; but if it were not the case mankind would not be spending these vast sums, all over the earth, on armies and navies; The Hague Conference would not have refused to admit any discussion as to the limitation of armaments; and your President, the chief—as you yourselves insist—of the most pacific nation in the world, would not have sent a recent message to Congress, asking for four new battleships of the most advanced and formidable type. Women may say what they please, but the whole present state of the civilized world shows that force, physical force, armed with the most deadly inventions known to the brain of man, is what each modern state in the long run and in the last resort depends on for its national existence. We may lament that it is so; we may look forward to a time when the world will be really ruled by arbitration; but that day is a long way off. And, meanwhile, women have no right to claim full political power in a State where they can never themselves take the full responsibility of their actions because they can never be called upon finally to enforce them.

There is a greatness in self-restraint, as there is a greatness in self-assertion. Let us insist with all our will on our public right to educate children, to have a say in reforming the dwellings of the poor, in the moral and physical purification of our towns, in the brightening of our country life, in the national care of the sick and insane, and upon equal opportunities with men in the realms of science and art. But let us, in the name of common sense, leave to men the franchise which determines war and peace, diplomacy and finance, and those vast industrial affairs which are exclusively masculine—the franchise which elects the President and Congress, and puts a British prime minister in power.

WHY WOMEN DO NOT WANT THE BALLOT

WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE

(North American Review: 161:257-67. September, 1895.)

1. Suffrage is not a right of anybody. It is a privilege granted by the Constitution to such persons as the framers of the Constitution and the founders of the government deem best.

2. The old political proverb, "No taxation without representation," is utterly inapplicable to this question. It grew out of the tyrannical action of a government "across the sea," in which no one of all the people on whom the tax was levied had the faintest voice in the framing of the laws or in the choice of the government. We may be said to have in this country a great deal of representation without taxation, because, in thousands of instances, voters, and indeed the very men who impose the tax, own no property at all. But women who *are* taxed are represented by their relatives, by their potent influence, and by men's sense of justice, amounting even to chivalry, which the woman suffragists are doing all they can to destroy, but which has secured to them far more protection, far more independent control of their property, than men have reserved to themselves. The complement and object of taxation is not the right to vote, but the protection of property. And women's property is better protected than men's.

3. Equality does not mean identity of duties, rights, privileges, occupations. The sex differences are proof enough of this. The paths in which men and women are set to walk are parallel, but not the same. And the equilibrium of society cannot be maintained, nor the equipoise of the body, unless this is recognized. And St. Paul put it forcibly long ago: "If the whole body were hearing, where were the smelling?" Over-stocked professions, men and women crowding each other in and out of occupations, neglected duties, responsibilities divided until they are destroyed, must be the result if this unnatural idea be enforced.

4. The theory of increased wages for women, to be secured by giving votes to women-workers, is equally preposterous. Wages, like work, are regulated by the unfailing law of supply and demand. Work cannot be created, and wages cannot be forced up. If there are too many workers there will be less employment and lower pay.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND SOCIALISM

Woman's sex is a handicap to her—always was and always will be. From youth to old age every woman requires regular periods of mental and bodily rest—when these are denied, her life and health, and the birthright of her children are sacrificed. The major part of two years' leave of absence from a profession or occupation is required by a woman to become a mother; she must become a mother on an average of over four times if the race is to survive. A man may become the father of the largest family and never lose a day from the hardest manual labor—may, in fact, be stronger and more healthy because of daily muscular exertions, and becomes strongest when the most heavy lifting is required. Feminists believe woman could do the same if she were trained to it—physicians know that she cannot—the fact of sex versus the fancy of suffrage.

Since women need protection not required by men—do they secure it better as independent persons in the common count at the polls or as women whose very nature appeals to every noble trait in husband, son, or father to protect them?

It does not take an astute anti-suffragist to see red and danger under these circumstances. A body of hysterical women who have shown themselves regardless of the values of priceless treasures and the law of the land in England (and 112 of the American Suffrage Associations cabled support to the Pankhurst militants at the height of their outrages) misled by another body of heedless men who have shown themselves regardless of the rights of private productive property, and who have advocated soldiers shooting their officers in the back under cover of darkness—might plunge this nation into a sex war and social war not even equaled by the navalism and militarism of Europe—which has the merit of system, at least, in its destruction.

Nations can survive wars—no nation ever survived a decadent womanhood. "A salient point in the handling of the woman suffrage question in the last sixty-five years has been the vulgarizing of the woman it sought to dignify."

"Votes can right no wrong and solve no problems until a way has been thought out by means of which these things can be accomplished," admits Carrie Chappman Catt, head of the International Suffrage Alliance. Then what we need are ideas—not "Votes for Women"—and as Napoleon said: "You cannot outnumber a brain," we must find a way to right wrongs and solve problems before any number of votes can achieve progress. The comparison of laws shows that the way for women is the quiet, dignified, womanly, non-partizan, influence along moral and educational lines, by which she has, ac-

according to suffragists themselves, achieved everything, "if the franchise were omitted." With the vote she has accomplished nothing not accorded to her without the vote, except a certain notoriety in partizan politics.

According to suffragists, woman's political choice is needed in every activity of life—except that of deciding whether she shall become a voter or not. Here, though admittedly "the majority of women do not want to vote," we are told "they ought to want to." Why, merely to play with politics? Women should be divided and counted at the poles on every legislative fad that occurs, according to the feminists, and a majority of one would be as good as the majority of a million. If they get the vote—but the women of the 90 per cent who choose to stay out of politics must not be considered, according to suffrage logic. They should stand aside—and let the feminists misrepresent them in politics. On the same principle the one million men who want socialism in this country ought to make the twenty-five million who do not want it accept it anyhow, so that the socialists can try out the co-operative commonwealth. "Votes for Women" is the same sort of proposition—its enthusiasts have the same percentage approval among women as socialism among men—4 per cent—and these twin agitations are active allies.

IMPEDIMENTS TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

MRS. GILBERT E. JONES

(North American Review: 190:158-69. August, 1909.)

There is little doubt that we are indulging in a twentieth century "feminist" movement. It has been tried in the past and history repeats itself. Women have made themselves felt in the destiny of nations before now, and it will be interesting and instructive to see if the women's political efforts of today will be effectual and whether the results will be permanent.

The plea of the suffragists is for the equality of the sexes. They assume, as a rule, that women have been browbeaten and down-trodden; that they are now awakening; and if we are willing to admit the equality of the sexes, that they should stand on equal footing in the pursuit of industry and in the control of the government which they must obey. The anti-suffragists grant the equality of the sexes. Men are no better than the women, and science assures us that they are no more intelligent. But the "Anti" insists that the *difference* between the sexes shall not be ignored. Consequently all suffrage arguments may be reduced to the proposition of "*equality*;" all anti-suffrage argument to that of "*differentiation*."

The "woman suffrage" agitation has been in active operation since 1848. In these sixty years many more complex issues have been before the public and have been more generally and keenly felt. Slavery has been abolished, the Spanish war has been fought, and the silver problem has been settled, but we still have the woman suffrage question with us, after sixty years of dispute, from Massachusetts to California. Of late the efforts of the suffragists have been more pronounced, but their failures have increased proportionately. In the last twelve years the legislatures of the various States have turned down suffrage proposals on an average of once in every twenty-seven days. Why is it that the American public cannot be aroused? Such a simple issue, such simple arguments should have caught the popular imagination long ago. Public opinion has been at white heat many times in this interval. Take the civil war, for instance: the nation was determined to give the negro political equality; it was willing to go through a long and bloody war, and to give the lives of 500,000 men to have it done. The suffragists have been telling us, ever since the days of Lincoln, that we are denying our mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters a privilege to which they have as much right as the negro. Why is it that they have not set the country aflame, from one end to the other, with this argument? If they are right, the men of this country are not only unfair, but tyrannical, and public opinion, on which our government depends, has been countenancing manifest injustice. But even if they are wrong, if women have not the same right to political equality that all men have, why have they not succeeded? One would suppose the claims of the suffragist enough to rouse the most indifferent, so what have really been the impediments?

The thorough reform in the laws regarding women is unquestionably one impediment; the great respect which the American man has for the American woman is another. In no other country and in no other time has women been held in such high estimation as she is in the United States of America today. She has never before had such complete educational and industrial opportunities offered her. In social, civic, philanthropic centres she is a leading power. More women have their individual bank accounts here than in any other part of the world. Woman is granted freedom of religious expression, freedom of speech and pen, freedom from a too conservative home life and parental dependence. Complete emancipation is hers, if she chooses to find it—from a "preacher in the pulpit" to a "full-fledged blacksmith"—from "motherhood" to female "bachelorhood." The American woman of today, the average woman, is *further* in advance of the average woman of other countries than is any

other class of our population, and all this *without* the ballot. So where is the practical injustice in not granting women the vote?

No one can deny the equality of the sexes, but there is still a chasm between them, in spite of the fact that the heights on either side are equally majestic. This chasm has never been adequately explored, but it will not for that reason do to tell us that it does not exist. It is by instinct rather than by reason that the great American public has remained passive on his subject. The American man feels strongly that he is, and must always be, the protector of his "women-public has remained passive on this subject. The American man feels dimly that the demand of women for the ballot "to protect themselves" is inconsistent with his protectorate. He is willing to give women everything they ask. But if he is going to protect women he *will* not give them the "ruling power." He cannot, therefore, be aroused to enthusiasm on the subject. The women feel this as strongly as the men, and that is why they cannot be aroused. That this attitude is unreasoning must be to a great extent admitted; that it is prejudiced must be strongly denied. It is an unstudied acknowledgment of the distinction between the sexes. If it is to be removed, then there will go with it much of the best that there is in men and women. When men come to feel that they are no longer the protectors of their wives, daughters, mothers and sisters, and when the women look to the ballot for their protection rather than to their husbands, sons and fathers, then woman suffrage will be a necessity and public opinion will be clamoring for it. But till this is true the subject will be one to which the American people will remain indifferent.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE PRO AND CON

CHARLES WORCHESTER CLARK

(Atlantic Monthly: 65:310-20. March, 1890.)

What would be the effect of woman's participation in politics on her character and life? Would she find herself burdened by an additional duty, or uplifted by the inspiration of broader interests? Women have their share of the world's work as it is, and on the principle of division of labor the duties of government should be left where they now are, with men. But, on the other hand, women ought not to be discouraged from entering any field of thought, least of all, as the English petitioners say, "the concerns of their country." Is participation in political action, then, essential to interest in political subjects? In certain cases, doubtless, it creates such an interest; it must be observed, however, that many of our most intelligent men, though to their shame, neglect their public duties entirely.

The educating power of the ballot is much exaggerated in popular estimation. Some women might be aroused by its possession, but only a few. Moreover, even for these few there is danger that the right of suffrage would develop false ideals. The work of the home is already too much put off upon school and church. The idea seems to be prevalent in some quarters that commonplace women will do well enough for mothers, but that superior women should teach. One of the latter class has lately said that a college graduate "had no business to go and get married." It was "obtaining her education on false pretenses." Her higher duty lay in the schoolroom. In the same way, the past year has furnished abundant illustration, in its prohibition campaigns, of the notion that the ballot, woman's ballot if she had it, could do the work for morality which the home, the church, and the school combined have failed to do. If women actually had the ballot, those of them who cherish this mistake would indulge in it still further, and until disappointment taught them wisdom, would neglect their real opportunities for their imaginary ones. They would lower themselves in the delusion that they were elevating politics. In this respect, then, to just what extent it is idle to conjecture, woman suffrage might at present, in this country, have an injurious effect on her ideals and life. I do not wish to magnify this danger, nor to underrate the benefit which the franchise would confer on women who have both opportunity and disposition to make the most of it. Its influence in enlarging their range of thought, and in giving them one more common interest with men, would be one certain good result of their enfranchisement; but it would be realized by comparatively few. To the majority, suffrage would be only a burdensome duty, sometimes ill performed, more often neglected.

There seem to be two theories of women among those who hope for her future. With no others have we anything to do. According to one view, she is a creature in an inferior position; oppressed, kept in subjection, held down by the might of man; a creature without opportunities, or chance to show what she is, or what she can do. The laws are against her; customs are but seemingly in her favor; politeness is a gilded form of contempt. If this theory be true, then by all means, let emancipation be eagerly pursued, and brought about as soon as possible. Let liberty have her full course. Hands off! We must all conspire to lift women up; to put them on the same level with us; to abolish every vestige of ownership or subjugation. Every right-minded man desires no less than this. The other theory regards woman as an independent creature; with a genius of her own, having a record in the past, a work in the present, a career in the time to

come, providentially placed and equipped, and simply misapprehended. If this account be received, then all she needs is appreciation, a hearty welcome, an honest sympathy. Encourage her shyness. Applaud her achievements. Let all doors that lead into cellars be kept shut. Let her not be set to tasks that she cannot perform. Let her not be invited to imitate men, or to enter into competition with them. Let her services to society be gratefully acknowledged and more like them be asked for. She is the complement of man, and of course man cannot get along without her. If he is the hand, she is the heart; not his superior, but his equal in another sphere. It is needless to say that this latter theory is the one accepted here.

WHY THE SUFFRAGE SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED TO WOMEN

ROSE TERRY COOKE

(Extracts from *The Chautauquan*, April, 1891. Vol. XIII.)

Women are physically unfitted to vote. Their nervous organization is subject to fluctuations, which as every physiologist knows, affect their reason and judgment.

Women are mentally unfitted to vote. While I have the greatest respect for women as women, and consider them in many respects superior and in some others equal to men, I cannot deny that their mental constitution is entirely different, and entirely incapable of grappling with many questions that are everyday matters to the understanding of men. They have keener apprehension of absolute ethics than men, no doubt; but in the political issues of the day, ethics are out of place, expediency is the desirable thing. Women argue concerning things as they should be, men consider things as they are. No amount of training could ever remold a true womanly nature to accept evil as a necessary factor, a thing to be appeased and persuaded in managing any form of government.

The great danger that threatens every republic is the ignorance of the masses, who, in fact, conduct that form of government. It is the influx of foreign ignorance *en masse* that threatens our own country hourly. A republic is a splendid theory but it demands theoretic men to sustain it; ignore it as we may, there are millions of men in the world for whom despotism is a necessity; and it is this class who immigrate to us every day, who are undermining our institutions and shaking the very pillars whereon the house standeth, like their vengeful prototype. If women suffrage is to be allowed we double not only the numerical force of this threatening majority, but its moral—or immoral—influence.

Let our women, *all* our women, learn to cook even poor material into savory food, let them make clean and cheerful homes, bring up their children to consider drunkenness a sin instead of a misfortune, and make the men about them feel that a drunkard is an object of disgust and abhorrence, and they will more surely bring about the reform they covet than by trying to make laws that in the nature of things must be useless and therefore harmful.

Again, it is said that the influence of our women at the ballot box will be an influence of refinement; that their presence will control the rudeness and profanity of the stronger sex; here comes in again the refuting argument of the average woman. We see every day, in the journals of the day, that among that class of women who will form the majority of our voters if female suffrage is allowed, the profanity, the brutality even, of their own class of men is not checked or restrained. Indeed they are themselves the victims of a cruelty and evil atmosphere which they cannot escape, much less control. Why should they be more successful in the crowds that swarm about the ballot box?

It is also offered that women have finer and nobler instincts than men. That is true, but how will it help their voting? Those who are married will surely vote as their husbands tell them, unless their orders are contrary to those of their priests. The unmarried will be equally influenced by fathers, sons, brothers, or lovers. The old French judge said, whenever a male criminal was brought before him, "Who is the woman?" It might be asked with equal fitness of every feminine action, "Who is the man?" for as was said by another Frenchman of a certain authoress, "Every woman who writes has one eye on a man, except the Princess Hahn-Hahn, who has only one eye." In effect the voting of women would be merely to duplicate the votes of men, a result not to be desired.

And, finally, the voting of women would be the usurpation of the rights of men. The sexes are reciprocal, not identical, a truth the eager shriekers for woman's rights persistently ignore. It is not the rights of women as women they demand, but the right of women to be men, which neither nature nor education can achieve; for God in the beginning made them a separate creation: "male and female created He them," and constructed the woman to be "an *helpmeet* for" the man; not a duplicate of himself, but a counterpart; to help, to console, to purify. If she has failed of her true work, will it help her or the man to take up his share of the labor of life and leave her own to perish? Never! However sin and folly may try to elude or ignore it, God's ordinance is not destroyed by their small sneers. His word will not return unto Him void; the foundation standeth sure, it is the Lord's.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

JOSEPHINE HENDERSON

(Extract from *The Chautauquan*.)

The conservatism of a large class of well-read and intelligent women is worthy of consideration. Enfranchisement should not precede the wish for it. She hesitates to add one more burden when she sees how life has already filled full her hands, her head, and her heart.

On the other hand, suppose this class and all others should ask the privilege of voting and get it—would no perplexities arise? Until there is a reconstruction of the elements that go to make up woman, she will be a partisan—persons, not principles, will interest her supremely; special “causes” will appeal to her; again, supreme indifference will control her; she will always be an uncertain quantity in politics.

One result of universal suffrage will be simply to increase the number of voters; the vote of the respective fathers, husbands, and brothers will be increased by their respective households. Numbers would be materially changed, not results.

It is well nigh impossible to conduct an election without injustice, fraud, or crime, so large are the numbers to be handled; woman’s suffrage would increase enormously the difficulty, and who is bold enough to say that women would free from unwise, not so say ignorant or unscrupulous, voting?

It is assumed because women cannot vote that they are not a power in politics. It is a false assumption. Many a man can trace his rise in position to the favor of some woman. To be the power behind the throne is often as valuable as to be on the throne itself. Can you imagine that the woman who now has every intellectual field open to her, waiting for her to come in and occupy, and she will not, that such a one will be a power in the State, simply by casting a ballot? All admit that possibly more laws affecting the moral welfare would be passed by woman’s vote; we are not suffering from a lack of laws, but because they are not better obeyed. “The world is too much governed.”

If you fill one place you must empty another. Ask the man who has attained an office if he did not lose something to get it. The law of compensation is being overlooked as regards this subject. Woman has only so much strength, nerve, and brain; just so much of these as she gives to public affairs, just so much she takes from her own life and the lives of those dependent upon her. Why give up a positive good for an uncertain one?

REAL CASE OF THE REMONSTRANTS AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

O. B. FROTHINGHAM

(Arena: 2:175-81. June, 1900.)

The fact that woman exerts *power* instead of *force* is a reason for keeping her in her present condition, which is one of command. Wendell Phillips used to say that she had too much power, and ought to be held to more responsibility; but how voting would secure this I can not imagine, especially in these days of a secret ballot. Governments ought to rest upon power; they do, in fact, in the final resort, rest upon force, and this is embodied in the male sex. Termagants may borrow what comfort they can from the King of Dahomey's body-guard of females, but the King of Dahomey does not rank high among monarchs; neither do those who compose his body-guard rank high among women. Their feminine attributes are of the smallest. The necessities of the "service" have not proven favorable to their womanhood. It is true that on ordinary occasions a large number of men are released from military duty. The crisis seldom occurs when those under the legal line or above it are called. Still, they may be, they are liable. At one period of our civil war we were grateful for the reserve of women who could not be summoned to the front, and who were at liberty to wait on the wounded in hospitals, to solace the dying, to manage sanitary fairs, and attend to the various works of mercy, while stronger arms wielded weapons. It is a grand position, that of standing outside of strife and using moral power alone, keeping alive patriotism, inspiring valor, holding up the highest aims, animating sons, husbands, fathers, and breathing an atmosphere of pity and heroism aloof from the perils of camp life. This is a noble sort of disfranchisement, something wholly different from the disfranchisement of the pauper, the criminal, the insane. These are *discharged*; women are *exempt*. These are *set aside* as persons not human; women are absolved as constituting a higher class. There is a very real distinction between being placed among the beasts and being placed among the "ministering angels."

Another argument in favor of the retention of women in their present place is the preponderance in them of *feeling*, a preponderance that becomes the more striking as they become more perfect in the traits which distinguish the sex. This peculiarity acts as a disqualification in the sphere of practical politics, which rests mainly on sagacity, but is invaluable as an influence on society. The consciousness of possessing political responsibility may, in some cases,

ennoble; though that will depend on circumstances. The possession of the ballot may sometimes be of actual value. The strongest argument in favor of female suffrage ever heard turned on this latter point. A poor woman was brought before a police justice, charged with some offense. The judge imposed the heaviest sentence that was allowed by law. A bystander observed to his companion, "That woman ought to have been let off more easily." "Yes," replied the other, "she would have been if she could have helped herself. But, you see, she has no vote, and ours is an elective judiciary." Let us hope that all judges are not like that one, and that there are women who are not dragged before police courts. Whatever we may think of *theoretical* politics, the *practice* of politics is not ennobling. The educating power of the suffrage is sometimes overestimated. It *does* educate in chicanery, cunning, the arts of party management, the market price of manhood, skill in offering rewards for service. But does it educate in intelligence, a broad view of statesmanship, the love of justice, patriotism, humanity, respect for citizenship? Virtuous women cannot be aware of the dangers they will have to encounter if they enter the political arena. Society is not alive to the corruption that will follow the introduction of a new kind of bribery into national and State affairs. We need all the purity, modesty, reticence we can get, and it comes to us best, in the least adulterated form, from a class set apart and having simply a moral influence on the questions before the people. The importance of a mass of influence conditioned by moral restrictions alone can hardly be estimated too highly, and, at present, women hold this advantage. They will exert it more and more as they expand in the true graces that belong to their sex. Just now they come nearer to being a privileged body than any other under the sun, as near as our American institutions permit. Much more truly privileged than any European order, because purely ethical in character, not formally instituted, but ordained by divine decree. Even now deference is paid them, but this deference is but a shadow of what will be when they fully justify their calling. The old feudal politeness is but a symbol of the respect that will be rendered by the best minds to the arbiters of a sacred destiny. It may be conceded that the actual woman is no more virtuous than the man, but her genius is certainly more ethereal; her temptation to earthliness is less; she is delivered from the necessity of wading through mud to a throne.

SOME FACTS ABOUT SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

MRS. G. E. JONES

(Forum: May, 1910.)

Masculine hostility or indifference to Woman Suffrage may be an error, but it may also be an instinct. There must be a ground for hesitation in granting votes to women, if there still exists a large class of women who feel no drawing to the cause, together with a larger class who are really opposed to it, besides a larger majority of men who know that woman suffrage will prove unwise, inexpedient and generally speaking, futile.

If woman suffrage is to be granted, let it come because the wisdom, strength and knowledge of women are all needed and manifest; because she has grown beyond the requirements of the home and care of children, society, manners and customs.

What is wanted in politics is real work, thorough work, honest and more efficient work, not mere sham. Are women ready for better work than men are now doing? Hardly, and women will find it no task to do sufficiently well to outstrip the best class of political workers. The man is in constant contact with men, and face to face with events. He is in the larger world; he is everywhere, and he has become familiar with the workings of the political machinery. Women will always take observation from some protected quarter. They will generally obtain such fragments of legislation and activities as appear on the surface. But of the vital, fighting, political struggle which constantly goes on, and not generally in public view, the woman will necessarily learn what she knows only by hear-say or from some male informer. Women are not concerned equally with men in the character of government, and they very rarely have an equal knowledge of political events, even when their fathers, husbands and brothers are statesmen or politicians.

Woman suffragists proclaim that women need the ballot for their own protection—and that men make laws for women which are unjust and oppressive, and that women must have the law-making power in their own hands in order to secure fair play. American women do not need a law-making power—for, on the whole, the laws are even far more favorable to women (in many States) than they would have been if women, with their smaller understanding of vital conditions, had made the laws for themselves.

Taxation without representation is tyranny, but we must be very careful to define what we mean by the phrase. If we adopt the suffrage attitude, "I pay taxes, therefore I should vote," the natural conclusion is that *everybody* who pays taxes should vote, and we have

a tyrannical form of government. This argument is used in an unqualified way. We have a "tyranny" here, we are told, because some women pay taxes, yet do not vote. If this be true without any qualifications, it must be true not only of women, but of everybody. Accordingly this government is tyrannical if corporations pay taxes but do not vote; if aliens pay taxes but do not vote; if minors pay taxes but do not vote; if anybody pays taxes but does not vote. The only correct conclusion is, not that women should vote because some of them pay taxes, but that every taxpayer should be given the privilege of the ballot. Under our system of indirect taxation it is almost impossible to say that anybody is not a taxpayer—therefore, it would seem that *every* man, woman and child, naturalized or alien and every corporation, should vote. The absurdity of this is evident. Even if woman suffrage were granted, 50 per cent of the population would still be without the ballot, and every one of these could stand up and say, as the suffragists are saying now, "'Taxation without representation is tyranny.' I am taxed, but unrepresented, therefore I am being tyrannized over." It is clear that the phrase is distorted.

Citizens can be and have been disfranchised, but can still remain citizens and have all of a citizen's privileges. Chief Justice White of the United States Supreme Court decided that citizenship carried with it no voting power or right, and the same decision has been handed down by many courts in disposing of other test cases. A citizen of the District of Columbia has all the privileges of citizenship, but he cannot vote, since that is a State right, and the District of Columbia is not a State.

Citizenship merely does not entitle a man to vote. Government grants that privilege and enrolls on its lists of voters those **who must** be made liable for the State's safety and stability. Government does not let a man vote just to express his viewpoints by dropping a bit of paper in the ballot box. It demands the service and allegiance of a voter to the point of giving his life, as 500,000 men did during the civil war.

Men and women could not enjoy our present civilization if government had not that backing. In time of peace citizens must have a guarantee for life and property; it is just this force of the male voter that can be called upon when needed. This is a part of our strong constitutional democratic government.

Men and women are both citizens and enjoy exactly the same privileges of governmental administration, such as gas, light, police, schools, sound money, protection of life and property, sewers, paved

streets, transportation, hospitals, courts, judges, law and order, and what-not.

Miss Summer, in her book, "Equal Suffrage," clearly shows that women and children are no better paid in the four states where women vote than in the states where they do not vote. In suffrage states, taking public employment as a whole, women receive considerably lower remuneration than men. As teachers, women receive lower salaries on the average than men, as is shown in Table 19 of Miss Summer's book. The conclusion is inevitable that, on the whole, men teachers are better paid in Colorado than women teachers. "Equal pay for equal work" does not exist in woman suffrage states any more than it does elsewhere. These suffrage States are not very encouraging as object lessons.

Colorado was admitted into the Union in 1876, and great efforts were made by the suffragists to secure the "Centennial" State. This resulted in the submission of the question to the people, who rejected it by a majority of 7,443 in a total vote of 20,665. From the first of the agitation of the free coinage of silver, Colorado has been enthusiastically in favor of that measure. In 1892 her devotion to it caused all parties to unite on that issue, and gave the vote of the State to General Weaver, Populist candidate for President, and to David H. Waite, Populist candidate for Governor. The question of woman suffrage was resubmitted to the people at this election, and the constitutional amendment concerning it was carried by a majority of only 5,000 in a total vote of 200,000. Neither that movement nor its results present triumphant democracy.

Colorado is most frequently cited as the banner suffrage State; yet, there the granting of the ballot has not yet purified politics. The effect upon party politics has been very slight. Politics are as corrupt in Colorado as in any state in the Union. Judge Lindsey has just written an article in "Everybody's Magazine," entitled "The Beast and the Jungle," which certainly does not indicate either peace or purity in politics.

Probably the Juvenile Court of Colorado has been most often pointed to as a triumph of a woman's ballot. Yet, in *nineteen out of the twenty-one States which have Juvenile Courts today women do not vote*. Moreover, in the four in which they do, *two* are without such courts. Nor was Colorado the *first* to establish such a court, but instead, Massachusetts, where three years before the women of the State had rejected equal suffrage. In other words, it would appear that the juvenile court *can be and is achieved without the female ballot*. In Colorado, divorces are more easily obtained than in our own State, and after a very short period of time.

Suffragists say women should make their own laws—but, after forty years of woman suffrage in Utah and Wyoming, we find that like all other States, men make the laws and women derive many benefits from them. Women do not do jury duty, and are not judged by peers of their own sex, nor is there any demand for such a state of affairs.

Utah was the first territory in this country in which woman suffrage gained a foothold. Woman suffrage was coincident with the establishment of the Mormon church, and it came as a legitimate part of the union of church and State, of communism, of polygamy. The dangers that especially threaten a constitution or *republican form* of government are *anarchy, communism, and religious bigotry*; and two of these found their fullest expression in this country in the Mormon creed and practice. Fidelity to Mormonism was disloyalty to the United States government. The Mormon church is the greatest political power in any of the suffrage states. By the very nature of its teachings, and as indicated by Brigham Young himself, the basis of the Mormon church is *woman*. Thus the introduction of woman suffrage within its borders was not only undemocratic—it was anti-democratic. Utah has granted its women full suffrage for nearly forty years, and they have lived openly and defiantly in a state of complete polygamy, until a command for reform came from outside the polygamous State.

Anna Shaw says that a woman without a vote has no self-respect. Woman's self-respect did not change *this evil*, and it is said that polygamy will continue in Utah, just because *women* exercise a *political power*. So much for self-respecting suffragists and Utah.

Woman suffrage was secured in Wyoming by means that bring dishonor upon democracy. Wyoming was organized as a territory in 1868. Many of its native settlers were from Utah. The *History of Woman Suffrage* records the fact that the measure was secured in the first territorial legislature through the political trickery of an illiterate and discredited man, who was in the chair. Mr. Bryce, in *The American Commonwealth*, alludes in a note to the same fact. Women voted in 1870. In 1871 a bill was passed repealing the suffrage act, but was vetoed by the governor on the ground that, having been admitted, it must be given a fair trial. An attempt to pass the repeal over his veto was lost by a single vote. Certainly the entrance of woman suffrage into Wyoming was not a *triumph of democratic progress and principle*.

In 1894 the Populist party of Idaho put a plank in its platform favoring the submission of a woman suffrage amendment to the people. In 1896 the free silver Populist movement swept the State.

A majority of the votes cast on the suffrage question were cast in its favor, but not a majority of all the votes cast at the election. The supreme courts have generally held that, in so important a matter, a complete majority vote was required, but the supreme court of Idaho did not so hold, and woman suffrage is now established in that State. This, also, is hardly a success of sound democracy.

Women suffragists should be severely criticised for the vague way in which they promise the wage-earning women increase of wage, when the ballot is within her power. How this can be accomplished has not yet been demonstrated by the suffragists, and their promises are neither convincing nor instructive. The economic "equality of the sexes" cannot be proven, and the "antis" challenge their opponents to show the ballot can be used to bring about the remedy in question for the wage earning woman.

It is by instinct rather than by reason that the great American public has remained passive on this subject—our American man feels strongly that he is, and always must be, the protector of his "women-folk." He does not ask why—he knows it is true. He also feels dimly that the demand of women for the ballot "to protect themselves" is inconsistent with the true American spirit.

When men come to feel that they are no longer the protectors of their wives, daughters, mothers, and sisters, and when the women look to the ballot for their protection, rather than to their husbands, sons, and fathers, *then* woman suffrage will be a necessity and public opinion will be clamoring for it.

tion to deliver public lectures in Texas towns, when asked to do so. About a hundred lectures in fifteen different lines of work are now available.

Public Welfare Division.

It is the purpose of this division to collect data regarding economic conditions in the State and to furnish the same to citizens of Texas through exhibits of photographs, charts, diagrams, statistics, etc., supplemented by illustrated lectures and printed bulletins.

Division of Public School Improvement.

The Division of Public School Improvement has charge of the various educational exhibits sent out by the University to fairs and other large gatherings, for the purpose of calling the attention of the people to some of the crying needs of Texas and point out the most intelligent method of meeting these needs.

Correspondence Division.

The University of Texas now offers for home study correspondence courses in the following subjects of college grade: Botany, Civil Engineering, Drawing, Economics, Education, Electrical Engineering, English, French, Geology, German, Government, Greek, History, Latin, Mathematics, Mining, Engineering, Philosophy, Public Speaking, Spanish, and Zoology.

The following correspondence courses preparatory to Teachers Certificates are also offered: Algebra, Bookkeeping, Chemistry, Geometry (Plane and Solid), History of Education, History (general), Literature, Physics, Psychology, and Trigonometry.

Programs and courses of study for clubs or other associations are also offered. Correspondence is invited.

For complete catalog of the Department of Extension, address Director of the Department of Extension, University, Austin. Inquiries relating to a particular division should be addressed to the head of that division.

